DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 305 089 IR 052 710

TITLE	Toward Descriptive Standards. Report and Recommendations of the Canadian Working Group on Archival Descriptive Standards.
INSTITUTION	Bureau of Canadian Archivists, Ottawa (Ontario).
REPORT NO	ISBN-0-88925-680-2
PUB DATE	Dec 85
NOTE	201p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC09 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Archives; *Cataloging; Depository Libraries; Foreign Countries; Library Science; Machine Readable Cataloging; Questionnaires; *Standards; Surveys
IDENTIFIERS	*Canada; *Descriptive Research

ABSTRACT

Building upon recent efforts of Canadian archivists to improve the development and application of technology in order to achieve more effective control of and access to their holdings, this report contains the deliberations and recommendations of the Canadian Working Group on Archival Descriptive Standards, which held seven meetings between April 1984 and March 1985. The report begins with a brief history of attempts to establish standards as a means of demonstrating what progress has been made and what remains to be done. The first of four chapters then discusses--on a theoretical level--issues related to description and the standards needed to establish a conceptual framework within which to analyze the current situation and to present recommendations for future development of standards. The second chapter explores the variety of standards available, with particular emphasis on those most relevant to archival needs. The third chapter describes a survey conducted by the group, who sent a questionnaire to 361 Canadian repository libraries (response rate = 56%) to obtain information about the current construction of archival finding aids. The data are analyzed and the findings discussed. The fourth chapter presents the 35 recommendations made by the group together with a brief discussion of each recommendation. A concluding statement encourages Canadian archivists to take advantage of automation and launch the development of descriptive standards. Four appendixes are provided: a list of the respondents; the survey questionnaire; an outline of the data fields in an archival database; and a 267-item annotated bibliography. (CGD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED305089

TOWARD DESCRIPTIVE STANDARDS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Report and recommendations of the Canadian working group on archival descriptive standards

IR052710

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Theresa Rowat

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BUREAU OF CANADIAN ARCHIVISTS

TOWARD DESCRIPTIVE STANDARDS

TOWARD DESCRIPTIVE STANDARDS

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE CANADIAN WORKING GROUP ON ARCHIVAL DESCRIPTIVE STANDARDS

Bureau of Canadian Archivists

Ottawa

December 1985

Toward Descriptive Standards
Report and Recommendations of the Canadian Working Group on Archival Descriptive Standards

© Bureau of Canadian Archivists 1986

Canadian Cataloguing in Publication Data

Bureau of Canadian Archivists. Working Group on Archival Descriptive Standards.
Toward descriptive standards

Bibliography: p.

1. Cataloguing of archival materials — Standards. 2. Descriptive cataloguing — Standards. I. Title.
Z695.2.B87 1986 025.3'414 C86-091272-8

ISBN 0-88925-680-2

Typeset by The Typeworks, Vancouver, B.C.
Printed by Friesen & Sons, Altona, Manitoba

Contents

Members of the Working Group	vii
Abbreviations	viii
Acknowledgments	ix
Introduction	1
1 The Context of Descriptive Standards	6
2 Existing Standards	19
3 A Study of Current Practice	34
4 Toward Descriptive Standards	54
Conclusion	77
Appendix A: Respondents	81
Appendix B: Questionnaire	90
Appendix C: Data Fields	95
Bibliography	103

Members of the Working Group on
Archival Descriptive Standards
of the Bureau of Canadian Archivists

CO-CHAIRMEN:

Marcel Caya
University Archivist,
McGill University, Montreal,
Quebec

Terry Eastwood
Chairman, Master of
Archival Studies Program,
School of Library, Archival
and Information Studies,
University of British Columbia,
Vancouver, B.C.

MEMBERS:

Marion Beyea
Provincial Archivist, Provincial
Archives of New Brunswick,
Fredricton, New Brunswick

Victorin Chabot
Chief, French Archives Section,
Manuscript Division,
Public Archives of Canada,
Ottawa, Ontario

Jean Dryden
Acting Assistant Provincial
Archivist, Provincial Archives
of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta

Jacques Grimard
Conservateur adjoint,
Archives nationales du Quebec,
Quebec, Quebec

Anne MacDermaid
University Archivist,
Queen's University,
Kingston, Ontario

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY:

Alain Clavet
Archives Branch,
Public Archives of Canada,
Ottawa, Ontario

OBSERVER:

Ralph Manning
Senior Co-ordinator for
Standards, National Library of
Canada, Ottawa, Ontario

RESEARCH ASSISTANTS:

Laura Coles
Richard Gingras
Katherine Myers

Abbreviations

AACR2	*Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules*, 2d ed.
AAQ	Association des archivistes du Québec
ACA	Association of Canadian Archivists
AFNOR	Association française de normalization
AMC	Archives and Manuscripts Control (MARC)
ANSI	American National Standards Institute
ASTED	Association pour l'avancement des Sciences et des techniques de la documentation
BSI	British Standards Institution
CC:DA	Committee on Cataloguing: Description and Access
CCF	Common Communication Format
CCM	Canadian Committee on MARC
IASSIST	International Association for Social Science Information Service and Technology
IFLA	International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions
ISBD	International Standard Bibliographic Description
ISO	International Standards Organization
LCSH	*Library of Congress Subject Headings*
MARC	Machine Readable Cataloguing
SAA	Society of American Archivists
SPIRES	Stanford Public Information REtrieval System
SSHRCC	Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada

Acknowledgments

The Working Group would like to express its appreciation to all institutions and individuals who assisted in the production of this report. We are particularly grateful for the assistance of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, which provided the funds enabling the members of the Group to hold discussions, conduct the survey, analyze the data, and publish the results of their deliberations. We would also like to thank the Public Archives of Canada for providing funding to prepare the original proposal and the services of Alain Clavet as secretary, and the National Library for its support in making Ralph Manning's expertise available to the Group.

Of course, the survey of existing practice could not have been done without the participation and co-operation of those repositories which responded to our questionnaire and whose staff assisted members of the Group who administered the questionnaire during personal visits.

This report represents a collective effort of the entire Group, each member of which contributed through study and discussion of the question of descriptive standards for archival materials. The Group owes special thanks to Jean Dryden and Terry Eastwood who drafted and edited the final version of the report. We also wish to thank Katherine Myers, who provided assistance in compiling a bibliography, Richard Gingras, who edited the data collected in our study

of Quebec practice, and Laura Coles, who input the data from our study of English-language practice and assisted in data analysis and editing of the final report. Laura was involved with the project from its early stages, and her assistance with myriad details proved invaluable.

The Group hopes that this report will provide the direction and impetus for the development of archival descriptive standards in Canada.

This report is being published in a separate French version.

Introduction

The development of descriptive standards as a means of bringing increasingly voluminous and complex archival holdings under intellectual control has long been a concern of archivists. This report builds upon recent efforts by Canadian archivists to improve the development and application of methodology in order to achieve more effective control of and access to their holdings. A brief history of these attempts is worth while to demonstrate what progress has been made and what remains to be done.

The report of the Consultative Group on Canadian Archives, published in March 1980, noted that the lack of standards for the description of archives "seriously hinders the creation of an information system at the national level." However, the issue was so complex that the Consultative Group could not see its way clear to recommend anything concrete with regard to standards and networks. In June 1980, a resolution was passed at the annual general meeting of the Association of Canadian Archivists (ACA) that the Association establish a task force on standards for the arrangement and description of archival materials. Attempts by the ACA to get a task force under way failed utterly because no source of funds could be found to support the work. In the meantime, a group of archivists from Ottawa and Montreal began meeting to discuss the problem of standardizing the production of finding aids. Eventually, their work was spon-

sored by the Association des archivistes du Quebec (AAQ) and resulted in the publication of *Les Instruments de recherche pour les archives.*

The Congress on Canadian Archives held in Kingston in 1982 again addressed the issue by passing a resolution that

> the Bureau of Canadian Archivists establish a working group consisting of experienced archivists for the development of national standards for the arrangement and description of archives, oversee the appointment of members to the working group in consultation with the Dominion-Provincial-Territorial Archivists, regularly inform the Canadian archival community of the activities and progress of the working group and submit a grant proposal for the purpose of drafting such national standards for archival materials of all media.

It was felt that the Bureau of Canadian Archivists, the umbrella body representing the common interests of the ACA and the AAQ, would be the most appropriate agent for this work. The recognition that financial resources would be necessary for such an undertaking had a large part to do with subsequent progress. The Public Archives of Canada generously provided funds for a committee of two — Terry Eastwood and Marcel Caya — to draft a funding proposal which was submitted on behalf of the Bureau of Canadian Archivists to the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRCC) in September 1982. Because SSHRCC has always had difficulty fitting archives into its schemes designed primarily to support academic research, the request received no response for more than a year. However, in November 1983, notification was received that an award of $97,250 had been granted to the Bureau of Canadian Archivists to establish a Working Group on Archival Descriptive Standards whose overall goal was "to produce a set of proposals for adoption by the Canadian archival community in the area of developing standards and guidelines

for the description of archival materials." With this aim in mind, four areas of study were planned:

> i) the type of finding aids currently produced by Canadian repositories for their holdings in all media.
> ii) the data elements captured by Canadian repositories in the production of finding aids.
> iii) the standards or guidelines developed by Canadian repositories to control descriptive practices.
> iv) standards or guidelines development outside Canada and in other fields and applicable to archival descriptive work.

At the end of twelve months, the period for which the grant was tenable, the Working Group's report was expected to focus on four areas:

> i) the extent to which current descriptive practices have developed along similar lines and may be further codified.
> ii) prospects for the production of a Canadian data element dictionary or, more properly, an extensive glossary of terms used in descriptive work.
> iii) prospects for the systematization of intra-institutional and inter-institutional finding aids to Canadian archival material.
> iv) recommendations with regard to the development of networks of information exchange with respect to the holdings of Canadian repositories.

The members of the Working Group were selected by the Bureau of Canadian Archivists with advice from the co-chairmen Marcel Caya, McGill University Archivist, and Terry Eastwood, Chairman of the Archival Studies Program at the University of British Columbia. The other members were: Marion Beyea, Provincial Archivist, Provincial Archives of New Brunswick; Victorin Chabot, Chief, French

Archives Section, Manuscript Division, Public Archives of Canada; Jean Dryden, Acting Assistant Provincial Archivist of Alberta; Jacques Grimard, Conservateur adjoint, Archives nationales du Quebec; and Anne MacDermaid, Queen's University Archivist. At the request of SSHRCC, an observer from the library community was appointed in the person of Ralph Manning, Senior Co-ordinator for Standards at the National Library of Canada, who played an important part in our deliberations. In addition, Alain Clavet of the Public Archives of Canada acted as executive secretary to the Group.

The Working Group had its first meeting in Montreal in April 1984. Subsequent meetings were held in June, October, and November 1984 and in January, February, and March 1985.[1] At the first meeting, it was clear that the Group could not hope to develop detailed standards for all media and would instead be preoccupied with the task of trying to plot a course rather than sail a ship. In other words, there was no point in plunging into the development of standards without first having a clear picture of where the archival community wanted to go. As well, Canadian archivists have had little experience in the area of developing descriptive standards, and no formal structures are in place to carry on such work. It was factors such as these which gave direction to the Group's deliberations. In the end, the Group tried as much as possible to take account of the circumstances of the Canadian archival community in formulating its study and recommendations.

The results of the Group's deliberations follow. Many in the Canadian archival community will be disappointed that the Group did not bring forth detailed standards and rules which institutions could then apply so that all description

1. For an account of the origins and early work of the Working Group, see the "Report of the Working Group on Archival Descriptive Standards of the Bureau of Canadian Archivists," *ACA Bulletin* 9, no. 2 (July 1984): 9-12.

and network development problems would be solved. Yet a thoughtful consideration of the report's recommendations and the issues underlying them should produce a realization that this is one of the most complex areas of archival work, and it would be impossible, not to mention foolhardy, to attempt to develop standards in a year. The Working Group believes that the report provides a solid basis for the development of descriptive standards for Canadian archives and looks forward to the discussion and debate which will be an inevitable part of this process.

15

1

The Context of Descriptive Standards

Because no one questioned the broad mandate of the Working Group to explore the issue of descriptive standards for archival material, one might assume that there is some generally held concept of what descriptive standards are. However, when members of the Group began to grapple with the problem of description of archival material, it was immediately evident that no such concept existed. As investigation continued, the complex nature of archival description became apparent, and it was clear that the final report would have to address certain issues related to description and standards at a theoretical level. Such a discussion would be essential to establish the conceptual framework within which to analyze the current situation and present the recommendations for future developments.

A. COMMON ASSUMPTIONS

It should be understood that any discussion of descriptive standards must itself take place within a framework of commonly accepted assumptions about established archival practice. First and foremost, the principle of provenance is assumed to be the basis for the organization and arrangement

of archival *fonds* [1] regardless of the physical form the records take. That is, archival material created by an individual or a corporate body will be kept as an entity and not dispersed into various subject or chronological classifications, and wherever possible, the original order of the material will be maintained inasmuch as it reflects the activities and organization of its creator.

Secondly, it is assumed that the arrangement of archival *fonds* is based on levels, and it is generally agreed that there are five levels of arrangement: repository; record group or *fonds*; series; filing unit; and item. It is also assumed that archival description reflects arrangement, and thus there are certain agreed upon levels of description as well. These are: inter-institutional; repository; thematic group; record group or *fonds*; series; filing unit; and item. The close relationship between levels of arrangement and levels of description is crucial to an understanding of many of the recommendations which make up this report.

Thirdly, there are several assumptions related to finding

---

1. The Group prefers to use the French term *fonds d'archives,* or simply *fonds,* in both the English and French version of this report to avoid certain terminological confusion which has grown around the terms "record group," "manuscript group," "collection," and so on, in current North American practice. *Fonds* may be defined as "the whole of the documents of any nature that every administrative body, every physical or corporate entity, automatically and organically accumulates by reason of its function or of its activity." This definition may be taken to encompass documents in any form or on any medium created by agencies or persons acting in a public or private capacity.

   Fonds d'archives may be distinguished from collections of documents artificially brought together for whatever reason. Such collections are not unknown to Canadian archival repositories, but their arrangement and description, though they might follow some of the archival practices to be discussed, are not our major concern.

aids, which is the general term for all sorts of descriptive tools for archival material. For one thing, certain types of finding aids are considered appropriate to specific levels of description. Furthermore, the logical priority in the production and presentation of finding aids is from the general to the particular.

In the fourth place, the Group has been very conscious of the multi-media nature of Canadian archival holdings. Undoubtedly, the bulk of archival material is textual, and thus the issue of descriptive standards for such material touches the greatest number of archivists. However, every effort has been made to take into account the special needs of various forms of archival material. In particular, it is recognized that for many holdings such as cartographic material, sound recordings, photographs, and moving images, description of the individual item assumes greater importance than that of individual items in textual holdings.

It is clear then that the work of the Group has taken place within the broad framework of the Canadian archival tradition. Two final assumptions relate not only to the accepted practice of Canadian archives but also to the general mandate of the Group. The first of these assumptions is, of course, that archivists standardize their practices not only for their own purposes but also ultimately for the benefit of users. The work of the Group was supported by SSHRCC because of its interest in the scholarly use of archives, and the Group has been ever mindful of the need to facilitate users' access to archives. The second assumption — that standards are highly desirable and every effort should be made to work toward them — hardly needs to be stated. The idea that the unique nature of archival material prevents archivists from adopting standards or rules for describing their holdings is unacceptable to the Working Group. If archivists are to take full advantage of automation and the opportunities it offers for networking and information exchange, not to mention more efficient operation of manual systems, they must accept that standards are an essential

means of achieving these goals. Far from diminishing the archivist's flexibility and independence, standards allow the archivist to spend more time examining and arranging records instead of deciding on what form and style description will take.

B. WHAT IS DESCRIPTION?

As it is currently used, the term "description" does not in fact have an adequate definition. In part, this may be because description serves so many purposes. Whatever the accepted definition of the word, description is critical to virtually all aspects of archival processing and to a number of allied disciplines. Without adequate description, administrative control as carried out in functions such as acquisition and accessioning cannot be effectively maintained. Even before records are acquired, adequate description is an indispensable tool for appraisal of either their monetary or their historical value. As well, description is essential in related areas such as records scheduling. Description is of course imperative when it comes to making the holdings available to users. Without enumerating all possible purposes, it is clear that description plays a crucial role in an archives' traditional mandate to acquire, preserve, and make available historically significant records, and thus it is important to attempt to define it more precisely.

An examination of archival literature does not help define description, because most texts tend to dwell on questions of methodology rather than theory. In short, they beg the question of what description is. A preliminary definition would say that description is a major function in the processing of archival material, and the products of this function are finding aids of various sorts which give administrators control over their holdings and enable users and archivists to find information about particular topics.

This is a useful definition as far as it goes, but it is still very

broad, considering the wide variety of finding aids which archives produce for many media formats. Traditionally, archivists have not undertaken a rigorous examination of the description function and the various components within it. In order to analyze description, it is useful to look briefly at the field of librarianship and examine the library model. Some archivists would argue that we have nothing to learn from librarians since our holdings and methodologies are so different. However, despite acknowledged differences, which will be outlined, the Group feels that librarianship is already far advanced on the road toward standardization and is the field most closely related to archival description. While some wish to maintain staunch isolation from the library world, others recognize the waste of effort in trying to reinvent the wheel.

Cataloguing is the library function most analogous to the archival function of description. Cataloguing can be divided into a number of separate components. The following discussion uses the cataloguing of monographic material in print format as a model, since that is the best known format, but it must be understood that the functions apply equally to non-book materials. The various steps in cataloguing are:

1. The bibliographic description of the item. The "areas" prescribed by the International Standard Bibliographic Description as sanctioned by the International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions, and which are incorporated in *Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules*, second ed. (AACR2) are: Title and statement of responsibility area; Edition area; Material (or type of publication) specific area; Publication, distribution, etc. area; Physical description area; Series area; Notes area; and Standard number area.
2. The choice and formulation of non-subject access points, that is, the name/title entry points which serve as index terms to the bibliographic description.
3. The subject indexing of the content of the item which

will lead the searcher to items relevant to the particular topic of inquiry.

4. The classification of an item, which includes assigning a class number from a pre-established scheme (such as the Dewey Decimal or Library of Congress classification schedules) and a "book number" to complete the shelf location or call number of the item.

The first two components are commonly known as descriptive cataloguing; the last two are referred to as subject cataloguing or subject analysis. For the purposes of this report, it is particularly important to note the distinction between description and subject indexing.

The Group believes that certain aspects of the first three components of the library model of cataloguing are generally applicable to archival description. It is relatively easy to dismiss the classification function since there is universal agreement that to classify archival documents in the library sense would violate the basic archival principle of provenance. Certainly, archivists do assign call numbers or codes for purposes of identification and retrieval, but in most cases these numbers have nothing to do with a subject or chronological division, and there are no universally recognized systems of classification within the archival world.

While classification may not be relevant to archives, the three remaining cataloguing functions bear close scrutiny. The bibliographic description function parallels the most extensive and significant aspects of archival description. While several of the areas in bibliographic description have no equivalent in general archival description, the remainder are very relevant and closely comparable. The following table compares the library model with a general concept of archival description.

In the library context, the bibliographic description usually represents a discrete item but may also represent a "set" of volumes, a completed or continuing run of a serial, or even an *ad hoc* collection of pamphlets. The archival

AREA	*LIBRARY*	*ARCHIVAL DESCRIPTION (Applies to all levels of arrangement)*
Title and statement of responsibility (includes general material designation)	Title page (or substitute) transcription including title(s) and author(s); medium (or occasionally form)	Establishment of name of creator (individual or corporate body); medium
Edition	Edition, version, etc.	Applies to some material such as film or film script versions, date file versions, and other material described at the item level.
Material (or type of publication) specific area	Used for specifying mathematical data for cartographic materials, for type of presentation for printed music, and for chronological data for serials	Applies to specialized material
Publication	Place, publisher, date of publication	Date coverage
Physical description	Extent of item, description, dimensions, accompanying material	Extent (in linear metres of shelf space, number of reels, number of maps, etc.)
Series	Title, numbering of series	Not applicable in the library sense since archival *fonds* or items are not serial publications
Notes	Useful information not supplied elsewhere in the description	Information about subject content, and context in which the material was created and used
Standard number	ISBN, ISSN, etc.	May be applicable when describing single items

equivalent of "bibliographic description" can represent a *fonds*, a series, or an individual item; it may also be an inventory describing a *fonds* or record group which may include a list of file titles or items. A guide to the holdings of the repository or holdings relating to a particular theme would be similar to a bibliography or a catalogue of published items, that is, a number of individual bibliographic descriptions arranged in some fashion.

The second aspect of descriptive cataloguing — the selection of non-subject access points — also has a parallel in archival description. In the library context, the choice of access points involves a decision about what entries are needed to allow the user to find an item. For example, access may be desirable under the title, variants of the title, alternate titles, or a "conventional" title assigned by the cataloguer. Access is normally also provided from the names of the authors, co-authors, and so forth, whether they are personal names or corporate bodies. Illustrators, translators and other collaborators may also warrant access points. Rules have been established to determine the preferred form of name when variants exist such as different language forms, pseudonyms, or titles of nobility. Finally, traditional library practice requires the selection of a "main entry" or primary access point.

An archivist rarely has to puzzle over this "main entry" or primary access point, since archival *fonds* are almost invariably listed under the names of their creators. However, the use of additional entries has been unsystematic and arbitrary. Archivists rarely make a clear distinction between non-subject access points, which serve as index entries to the bibliographic description, and subject indexing. It would be useful to examine the differences. For archivists, determination of access points would involve decisions about preferred forms of names for individuals or corporate bodies (particularly government departments) creating the records, and references from the non-preferred forms. Many archival institutions have done this without much awareness of

what they were doing and very likely without distinguishing it from subject indexing. It is important for archivists to become more aware of the differences between the two functions, because each carries different implications when it comes to standardization.

Subject indexing is the third component of cataloguing which has a close parallel in archival description. In theory at least, archivists put considerable effort into indexing because, unlike libraries, archives have no classification system which alerts users to the general subject content of an item by means of a call number. Therefore, access to the content of archival holdings is dependent upon detailed subject indexing, which ideally should be carried out at the item level, although scarce resources and lack of training and methodology have prevented this from taking place. Many ways of achieving subject access have been tried. Most involve indexing by archivists, but others are based on automated indexing using keywords extracted from descriptions of series, filing units, or items. Whatever the method, this subject aspect is extremely important and must not be confused with other aspects of description.

The foregoing discussion has made it clear that the library model as it stands does not apply completely to archival description. For one thing, the sheer volume of archival material prevents archivists from dealing with discrete items. A second difficulty arises from the archival principle of levels of arrangement. In the third place, archivists are frequently dealing with *fonds* which contain material in many physical forms, and the relationship between all the parts must be maintained. A fourth problem is the tradition of archival finding aids which in many cases requires the searcher to go to several finding aids before locating the reference to the material required. For example, in many repositories the user starts at a card catalogue, which will help identify material which might be broadly relevant, and then proceeds to an inventory and/or file list to get to the particular relevant items. This relationship between finding aids is a

significant feature of existing archival description and must be taken into account when recommending standards of description.

Nevertheless, in the absence of a systematic model of archival description, the library model (with appropriate modifications) has much to recommend it as a basis for the Group's discussions. One difficulty is in the use of the word "description." Archivists generally use it in a broad sense to encompass all aspects of preparing finding aids for users or for administrative control. However, there is no name for the archival equivalent of the more narrow concept of "bibliographic description" as has been discussed previously in this report. For the purposes of this report, the term "archival description" is reserved for the archival equivalents of bibliographic description and the provision of non-subject access points, and "indexing" will be used to denote subject indexing. The phrase "preparation of finding aids" will be used to cover both bibliographic description and subject indexing.

C. WHAT ARE STANDARDS?

The discussion of archival description must be linked with the issue of standards. There is little difficulty in defining standards: they are benchmarks which are established for the measure of quantity, weight, extent, value, or quality. In a multitude of areas, standards have been established to set a minimum level of achievement or production and/or to indicate a common way of doing something. Archives have standards in a number of areas; for example, it is generally agreed that storage areas should be maintained at a temperature of 20 degrees Celsius and a relative humidity of 40 to 45 per cent. However, standards for description of archival material are virtually non-existent on a national scale, and even individual institutions would find it difficult to articulate any descriptive standards. In some cases, Canadian re-

positories have adopted or adapted existing library standards; other institutions have devised their own standards for their particular needs. Once again it is useful to look at the library world's experience with standards, for libraries have already reached a measure of international agreement on how their collections should be described.

The general standards for bibliographic description of various formats are set out in a series of International Standard Bibliographic Descriptions (or ISBDs) published by the International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions (IFLA). AACR2 is based on these ISBDs; it provides rules for description of various formats, rules for choice and form of name and title access points, and references. Authoritatively established forms for names of individuals and corporate bodies are found in the serial publication *Canadiana Authorities* published by the National Library of Canada. Examples of standards for subject indexing are *Library of Congress Subject Headings* and *Canadian Subject Headings*. Of growing importance in recent years has been the development of communications standards for the transmission of descriptive data in machine-readable form; in Canada the accepted standard is the Can/MARC format.

What are the characteristics of these library standards? For one thing, they are developed by a process of discussion among representatives of those who will have to apply the resulting standards. While the process of consultation has the disadvantages of delay and the need to compromise or provide alternatives, it has the advantages of producing realistic, achievable, and widely accepted standards. Once the standard is reached, it is recorded and disseminated in such a way that all concerned may be aware of it and apply it consistently. Because a standard cannot expect to cover every case, the publication of the standard is usually followed by the appearance of an interpretive guide or book of examples to provide assistance in dealing with particular problems. Adherence to the standards is strictly voluntary; the agencies establishing and disseminating the standards

have no authority to force compliance, impose sanctions, or penalize non-conformists. It seems likely that standards for archival description, when they are established, will share these characteristics.

D. DESCRIPTIVE STANDARDS FOR ARCHIVES?

The library world has been working toward descriptive standards since 1839, when Sir Anthony Panizzi established ninety-one cataloguing rules for books at the British Museum. However, the most progress has been made during the last fifteen years, spurred by automation. Why, at this time, should Canadian archivists be mounting a similar effort to work toward the establishment of descriptive standards for archival material? Much of the impetus for standards in libraries came because of the obvious advantages of being able to share cataloguing data and eliminate the need for hundreds of libraries to catalogue the same item. This force is irrelevant to archives because of the unique nature of archival material. However, other significant factors are encouraging archivists to standardize the preparation of finding aids. The establishment of standards undoubtedly leads to a more efficient operation. If rules are established, there is no need to waste time deciding what to do, or checking or trying to remember what was done before. Archivists have had a long tradition of reinventing the wheel; the adoption of descriptive standards would allow them to rechannel the physical and mental energy now wasted in setting up in-house systems. As well, it would make it easier to train new staff. While users had little input into the library standards established, they know when they visit a new library that the finding aid system will very likely be familiar because of the standardization of cataloguing data. Researchers in archives have long been resigned to the fact that they must learn a new system every time they arrive at a different repository, but their work would be much easier if a

standard system were adopted across the country.

The benefits to archivists and users are relevant to all institutions whether or not they are in a position to consider automated systems. Yet the prospect of automation exerts the strongest pressure to standardize. Of course, automation has the potential to improve efficiency by reducing the costs of some of the labour-intensive tasks in archives as well as providing better reference service by pooling databases so that users and other archivists can get up-to-date information on other repositories' holdings. Even though automation imposes a critical examination of the way things are done and requires a form of standardization, automation does not create standards for a profession. The existence of descriptive standards independent of any particular application provides a reference point for budgetary authorities and vendors of software packages.

Few would quarrel with the benefits of standardization. But what aspects of description must archivists seek to standardize? First of all, there must be some agreement on the types of finding aids. Secondly, the elements which characterize each type of finding aid must be defined. Thirdly, the format and presentation of these elements must be established. For instance, what is an inventory and what is it used for? What information should an inventory contain? And what should it look like? Standardization of each of these areas is important. It is the work of the Group to make recommendations which will move the Canadian archival community toward these goals. While many would argue that this should have happened long ago, it is not too late to begin.

2

Existing Standards

In any undertaking, it is useful to establish a level of excellence as the goal to be achieved. Standards for the achievement of excellence have been developed by various professions to direct their work in an orderly way and allow them to judge their level of attainment upon completion of the task. Within the field of information management, a series of standards has been developed by the library profession which is of interest and possible relevance to the archival world.

Problems related to the description of information in print and non-print form, to indexing, and to data communication have all been considered, and workable solutions have been codified by a variety of national and international bibliographic groups. It must be noted at the outset that no single set of universal standards exists. Nevertheless, a number of existing standards created and ratified by whatever body are definitely relevant to archival description. This chapter explores the variety of standards available, with particular emphasis on those most relevant to archival needs.

An important distinction must be made between ratified national or international standards and the practical rules that emerge in a profession. In some cases, specific rules develop out of international standards. For example, AACR2 is the revision of earlier rules in conformity with the international guidelines contained in ISBDs. In other cases,

specific practices initially developed by a particular institution may eventually become so widely used that they become *de facto* standards. An example of this would be the *Library of Congress Subject Headings*, which were initially developed only to meet the needs of the Library of Congress's collections. These headings are now used by many research and public libraries throughout North America and have become one of the most important standards for subject indexing.

A brief bibliography is appended to this chapter. The first two parts contain the most relevant documents produced by various international and national standards bodies. Part III is a fully annotated bibliography of the most relevant standards related to the various aspects of archival description identified in Chapter 1. In general, the standards produced by standards bodies are more in the nature of guidelines; the specific rules which deal with particular problems of description will be found in the annotated portion of the bibliography.

A. INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS

The place and relevance of international standards requires specific comment. In this area, a variety of bibliographic standards have been established in the past two decades. The system for International Standard Bibliographic Description (ISBD) was developed by working groups of the International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions (IFLA). A number of related ISBD standards have been issued, including ISBD(M) Monograph, ISBD(NBM) Nonbook Material, ISBD(CM) Cartographic Material, and the "umbrella" standard ISBD(G) General, which forms the unifying basis for the others and ensures their compatibility. These international standards have a triple intent: to form a framework in which records from different sources or countries can be easily integrated into library catalogues in any other country; to assist in interpretation of records across language barriers; and to assist in the conversion of biblio-

graphic records to machine-readable form. Each ISBD lists all the bibliographic data elements which are required to describe and identify those types of material likely to appear in library collections; it assigns an order to those elements and prescribes a pattern of punctuation for isolating each element in the completed description. Agencies or repositories making use of the ISBDs may selectively choose the elements relevant to the description of the material at hand, provided that they present the elements in the required order and with the punctuation prescribed by the relevant ISBD.

Although they provide a general framework, the ISBDs are not meant to be used as a set of cataloguing rules. Nevertheless, in the absence of more detailed national guidelines or standards, the ISBDs have in fact been used as cataloguing rules in some countries, primarily in the Third World but notably also in France. Because ISBDs are necessarily brief, they are often accompanied by explanatory handbooks issued by specialists in the area of work concerned.

Among other IFLA standards relevant to archives, *UNIMARC: Universal MARC Format* deals with machine-readable bibliographic data. The handbook accompanying the format describes the purpose and scope of *UNIMARC* as follows:

> to facilitate the international exchange of bibliographic data in machine-readable form between national bibliographic agencies. The scope of *UNIMARC* ... is to specify the tags, indicators, and subfield codes to be assigned to bibliographical records in machine-readable form, and to specify the logical and physical format in which the records and their content designators are held on magnetic tape. It covers monographs, serials, and cartographic materials, with extensions to accommodate additional materials planned for the future.[1]

1. Alan Hopkinson, *et al.*, comps., *UNIMARC Handbook* (London: IFLA, 1983), p. 1.

The handbook augments the *UNIMARC* format with additional information concerning the relationship of the ISBD to field content, clarifications, examples, and recommendations concerning various problem areas. The handbook also assists in the drawing up of conversion programs between national MARC formats and *UNIMARC*.

While the *UNIMARC* format acts as an umbrella standard for the various national MARC formats, a new superstructure is emerging with the publication in late 1984 of *CCF: The Common Communication Format*. This format is intended to provide common ground between standards of various groups, notably libraries and abstracting/indexing interests.

A further group of international standards of relevance to archives is published by the International Organization for Standardization (ISO). Typical examples are the *Format for Bibliographic Information Interchange on Magnetic Tape* (ISO 2709) and *Guidelines for the Establishment and Development of Monolingual Thesauri* (ISO 2788).

Broadly speaking, the agreed-upon international bibliographic rules are relevant to archival concerns. Although most of these existing international standards relate more closely to library than to archival materials, the general approach and even the specific guidelines could be applied to archival problems. Other examples of relevant international standards appear in the bibliography at the end of this chapter. Further work by Canadian archivists in the field of descriptive standards must take account of, and be seen in the context of, existing international standards.

B. NATIONAL STANDARDS

The national standards bodies of other countries have produced standards relevant to archives. Among national standards of interest to archivists would be the publications of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI), the

British Standards Institution (BSI), and L'Association française de normalization (AFNOR), some of which are listed at the end of this chapter.

The existence of several standards addressing the same problem is evidence of seemingly wasteful duplication of effort. Occasionally, however, national groups decide to differ from existing international standards documents for one reason or another. For example, the British Standards Institution chose to revise the text of the ISO standard dealing with the establishment and development of monolingual thesauri because they wanted to enlarge the scope to include procedures for dealing with compound terms.

C. OTHER STANDARDS

There is a third group of standards which cannot be categorized as national or international since they are established neither by an international body for use throughout the world nor by an official national body charged with the development of a range of standards. In some cases they are standards developed by particular institutions for their own purposes and adopted for use by other institutions; in other cases they are rules developed by national library associations or by joint committees of several national associations. The standards included in this miscellaneous group are generally far more specific than the national and international standards discussed previously in providing detailed rules to follow when describing various types of material. Canadian archives which use existing standards are most likely to be familiar with the standards included in this third category.

The survey responses which are discussed in detail in Chapter 3 indicate the infrequency with which any of the existing bibliographic standards are used by Canadian archives. The results indicate that rules and manuals are often being formulated outside the controls of existing standards documents. Standardization of description could be

achieved in several ways. The archival profession might decide to adopt certain existing standards; it might decide to amend existing standards for archival purposes; or it might prepare entirely new standards. It is imperative that such standards remain true to Canadian archival practice, but it seems sensible to hope that the work of allied professions may be usefully adapted. The strong leadership of Canadian cartographic archivists and librarians working together in the drafting of the ISBD(CM) has provided a valuable example of what can be achieved by co-operative efforts.

D. RELATED WORK

Recent efforts to analyze and standardize descriptive practices in the United States and England have concentrated on defining the universe of data elements which might be contained in archival information systems for both administrative operations and intellectual control. The work of the National Information Systems Task Force (NISTF) of the Society of American Archivists has resulted in the publication of *MARC for Archives and Manuscripts: The AMC Format,*[1] which is a manual of instruction for users of the US/MARC Archives and Manuscripts Control Format and contains a published version of the Society's *Data Element Dictionary* developed in its initial stages by NISTF. In England, the Society of Archivists' Methods of Listing Party has developed a data standard consisting of 8 main fields, divided

1. Nancy Sahli, *MARC for Archives and Manuscripts* (Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 1985). A related volume is Max J. Evans and Lisa B. Weber, *MARC for Archives and Manuscripts: A Compendium of Practice* (Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 1985), which summarizes the format field by field with examples of fully tagged records.

into 19 subfields, and 104 sub-subfields.[1] Both these data element standards have been developed with automation in mind. They are not in fact standards by which archivists can rule their descriptive practices, but rather definitions of the totality of fields of information which may be captured during the various stages of archival information processing. It is expected that such definition of data elements or fields will guide archivists who are developing computerized applications to their information systems.

1. Michael Cook and Kristina Grant, comps., *A Manual of Archival Description*, consultation draft 7 (8 November 1984) of the Archival Description Project, University Archives, Liverpool University, England, L69 3BX.

SELECTED STANDARDS DOCUMENTS

I. INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS

A. International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions (IFLA)

1. *ISBD (CM): international standard bibliographic description for cartographic materials.* London: 1977.
2. *ISBD (G): general international standard bibliographic description: annotated text.* London: 1977.
3. *ISBD (M): international standard bibliographic description for monographic publications.* 1st standard edition revised. London: 1978.
4. *ISBD (NBM): international standard bibliographic description for non-book materials.* London: 1977.
5. *UNIMARC: universal MARC format.* 2d ed., rev. London: 1980.
6. *UNIMARC handbook.* London: 1983.

B. International Organization for Standardization (ISO)

1. *Format for bibliographic information interchange on magnetic tape.* 2d ed. Geneva: 1981 (ISO 2709).
2. *Guidelines for the establishment and development of monolingual thesauri.* Geneva: 1974 (under revision, ISO 2788).

II. NATIONAL STANDARDS

A. American National Standards Institute (ANSI)

1. *American national standard for bibliographic interchange on magnetic tape.* New York: 1979.
2. *USA standard basic criteria for indexes.* New York: 1968.
3. *American national standard guidelines for thesaurus structure, construction, and use.* New York: 1974.

B. Association française de normalization (AFNOR)

1. *Principes directeurs pour l'établissement des thesaurus multilingues.* Paris: 1980.
2. *Principes généraux pour l'indexation des documents.* Paris: 1978.
3. *Thesaurus monolingues et multilingues — symbolisation des rélations.* Paris: 1980.

C. British Standards Institution (BSI)

1. *The preparation of indexes to books, periodicals and other publications.* London: 1976.
2. *Bibliographical references to maps and charts.* London: 1975, 1977. 2 pts. (predates ISBD (CM)).
3. *Guidelines for the establishment and development of monolingual thesauri.* London: 1979.

III. OTHER STANDARDS

A. Descriptive Standards

1. *Anglo-American cataloguing rules.* 2d ed. Ottawa: Canadian Library Association, 1978. 620 pp.

"Prepared by the American Library Association, the British Library, the Canadian Committee on Cataloguing, the Library Association, the Library of Congress; edited by Michael Gorman and Paul W. Winkler." The 2d edition of AACR is the result of a concerted effort to reconcile prior differences between British and American practices and generally to update the cataloguing rules to meet current requirements. It complies with generally established guidelines such as the "Paris Principles" of 1961 and the ISBD program. Widely used throughout the English-speaking world, it has been translated or is being translated into many languages including Japanese, Portuguese, Spanish, Finnish, Norwegian, Swedish,

Italian, Arabic and French. AACR2 provides detailed guidelines for the cataloguing of most formats of documentation: books, pamphlets and printed sheets; cartographic materials; manuscripts (including manuscript collections); music; sound recordings; motion pictures and videorecordings; graphic materials; machine-readable data files; three-dimensional artifacts and realia; microforms; and serials. In addition to rules for description, detailed guidelines are provided for the formulation of name headings in bibliographic records. Because implementation of AACR2 is widespread, many manuals and "interpretations" have been developed to clarify and exemplify its stipulations. It is under regular and careful review by the Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR.

2. *Règles de catalogage anglo-américaines.* 2d ed. Montréal: ASTED, 1980. 938 pp.

   French translation of AACR2 by Paule Rolland-Thomas with the collaboration of Pierre Deslauriers.

3. Gorman, Michael. *The concise AACR2.* Ottawa: Canadian Library Association, 1981. 164 pp.

   "A rewritten and simplified version of AACR2."

4. *Bibliographic description of rare books.* Washington: Library of Congress, 1981. 62 pp.

   "Rules formulated under AACR2 and ISBD(A) for the descriptive cataloguing of rare books and other special printed materials." The manual represents the interpretation by LC of AACR2, Chapter 2, in relation to early printed monographs and is widely accepted as a general guide for this material. Its creation was prompted by the inability to incorporate all appropriate changes gener-

ated by the ISBD(A) into AACR2 which was being completed just as ISBD(A) was issued.

5. *Cartographic materials.* Ottawa: Canadian Library Association, 1982. 258 pp.

   "A manual of interpretation for AACR2 prepared by the Anglo-American Cataloguing Committee for Cartographic Materials." Intended to elucidate and amplify Chapter 3 of AACR2. The Committee was established through the initiative of the National Map Collection, of the Public Archives of Canada and the Association of Canadian Map Libraries. The manual is widely accepted and is used by map libraries and archives throughout the Anglo-American community.

6. Hensen, Steven L. *Archives, personal papers and manuscripts.* Washington, Library of Congress, 1983. 51 pp.

   "A cataloguing manual for archival repositories, historical societies and manuscript libraries." This publication is rapidly becoming accepted as a guideline for the cataloguing of textual archival material.

7. White-Hensen, Wendy. *Archival moving image materials: a cataloging manual.* Washington: Library of Congress, 1984. 156 pp. plus appendices.

   The purpose of this manual is to provide instructions for describing materials held by film and television archives. Its stipulations are within the framework of Chapter 7 of AACR2 and the ISBDs.

8. Betz, Elisabeth W. *Graphic materials.* Washington: Library of Congress, 1982. 155 pp.

   "Rules for describing original items and historical collec-

tions." Based on both AACR2 and *Bibliographic description of rare books,* this manual is intended to amplify rules for the cataloguing of original and historical graphic materials as opposed to commercially published graphic materials such as filmstrips and slide sets which should be handled by reference to Chapter 8 of AACR2.

9. Dodd, Sue A. *Cataloging machine-readable data files.* Chicago: American Library Association, 1982. 147 pp.

   An interpretive manual prepared with the help of the American Library Association's Subcommittee on Rules for Machine-Readable Data Files. Acts as a manual to be used in conjunction with Chapter 9 of AACR2 in the cataloguing of data files and program files.

10. *Guidelines for using AACR2, Chapter 9, for cataloging microcomputer software.* Chicago: American Library Association, 1984. 32 pp.

    Prepared by ALA's Committee on Cataloguing: Description and Access (CC:DA), this manual is intended to fill the gap in the rules for microcomputer software. It is generally recognized that AACR2 does not meet this need, but the Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR2 has not yet addressed the problem. The need for standardized internationally endorsed rules is urgent but both the American and the British (see the next entry) communities wish to test their guidelines before submitting formal proposals for rule revision.

11. Templeton, Ray, and Anita Witten. *Study of cataloguing computer software: applying AACR2 to microcomputer programs.* 1984 (Library and information research report #28) London: British Library. 77 pp.

12. Weihs, Jean. *Nonbook materials: the organization of inte-*

grated collections. 2d ed. Ottawa: Canadian Library Association, 1979. 134 pp.

This edition is compatible with AACR2 and continues to have as its stated purpose the organization of materials, both book and non-book, in an all-media catalogue. It is widely accepted in libraries as the authoritative guideline for the cataloguing of non-book materials.

13. *Union list of manuscripts in Canadian repositories: guide for the preparation of returns*. Ottawa: Public Archives of Canada, 1982. 16 pp.

Although never intended as a standard, these guidelines have been adopted by many institutions as their standard for describing *fonds* of textual material.

B. Indexing Standards

1. *Library of Congress subject headings*. 9th ed. Washington: Library of Congress, 1980. 2591 pp. in 2 vol.

The list is an accumulation of subject headings established and applied by the Library of Congress since 1897. The 9th edition contains the headings established and applied through December 1978. It is kept up to date by cumulative supplements, and the 10th edition is expected early in 1986. Quarterly cumulated editions on microfiche are available, and the list exists in machine-readable form for on-line consultation. LCSH is widely accepted by libraries as the standard thesaurus for subject descriptors of their material and is used as a basis for much other indexing.

2. *Répertoire de vedettes-matière*. 9e ed. Québec: Bibliothèque de l'Université Laval, 1983. 4 vol.

Contains subject headings in the French language based

on LCSH and *Biblio*. Produced in collaboration with the National Library of Canada, the list is kept up to date by quarterly supplements issued on computer output microfiche. It is widely accepted both in North America and in France as the authority for subject descriptors in the French language.

3. *Canadian Subject Headings*. 2d ed. Ottawa: National Library of Canada, 1985. 477 pp.

Intended as an authoritative standard for the subject control of Canadian topics, it is a *de facto* extension of the Library of Congress subject headings.

4. *Name Authorities*. Washington: Library of Congress, 1974-

Includes personal and corporate names, conference headings, geographic names of political and civil jurisdictions, and uniform titles. Includes all name authority records in the computerized master file of the Library of Congress. Generally accepted by libraries as definitive for forms of name to be used in catalogues. Since 1981, names are established by AACR2, and retrospective conversion to these new rules is underway. Cross references and useful history notes for corporate bodies are included. Available only in microfiche and in machine-readable formats.

5. *Canadiana authorities*. Ottawa: National Library of Canada, 1976-

Provides a current list of verified name headings of Canadian origin in both English and French. Otherwise similar to the Library of Congress list (above) in all respects.

C. Communications Standards

1. *Canadian MARC communication format: monographs.* 3d ed. Ottawa: National Library of Canada, 1979-
2. *Canadian MARC communication format: serials.* 2d ed. Ottawa: National Library of Canada, 1979-
3. *Canadian MARC communication format: mini-MARC.* 2d ed. Ottawa: National Library of Canada, 1982-
4. *Canadian MARC communication format: authorities.* 2d ed. Ottawa: National Library of Canada, 1983-

These loose-leaf publications are kept up to date by periodic amendments. Their integrity is overseen by the Canadian MARC Office under the advice of the Canadian Committee on MARC (CCM). Adherence to the US/MARC format (cited below) as much as possible is a basic tenet of their existence, ensuring that North American libraries may continue to exchange data across boundaries with a minimum of technical conversion. The formats adhere to the international standards cited above for the exchange of information. The Monographs format encompasses the following materials: maps, globes, microforms, sound recordings, projected graphic materials, motion pictures and videorecordings, and technical reports. Machine-readable data files will be included shortly.

5. *MARC formats for bibliographic data.* Washington: Automated Systems Office, Library of Congress, 1980-

This is the U.S. standard for communication of bibliographic data, essentially the same as the Canadian standard (nos. 1-4 above). It includes the content designation for the Archival and Manuscripts Control Format which supersedes the manuscripts format.

3

A Study of Current Practice

A. PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE STUDY

As one of its objectives, the Working Group set out to ascertain the degree to which Canadian practices for the description of archives are already standardized. To fulfill this objective, the Group conducted a study of the preparation of finding aids in over two hundred Canadian repositories. Since common sense dictates that future efforts to standardize descriptive practices will necessarily have to build on what now exists, an understanding of the configuration of current practice must precede any analysis of where and how standards may be developed. A caveat ought to be registered at this juncture. This study is meant neither to expose individual instances of bad practice nor specifically to reveal exemplary practice. It was designed primarily to capture information about the current construction of archival finding aids. It did not seek to assess the effectiveness of those finding aids. In a similar vein, it ought to be recognized that establishing standards is not a substitute for designing effective systems of information retrieval.

With a few exceptions, all repositories listed in the *Directory of Canadian Archives/Annuaire des dépôts d'archives canadiens* (1978) were surveyed either by a member of the Working Group administering a questionnaire in person or by mailing a copy of the questionnaire to the repository. In all, 200

of the 361 repositories surveyed responded, a 56 per cent return. The respondents include virtually all of Canada's largest archives and a good representation of all types of repositories. The bulk of the returns came from government archives (about 40 per cent), university archives (about 20 per cent), and church archives (about 13 per cent). For the most part, those repositories not responding were small and staffed part time or by volunteers. A list of respondents appears in Appendix A.

The questionnaire was designed to compile a composite picture of the types of finding aids produced by Canadian repositories. A questionnaire form was filled out for each type of finding aid which each repository currently prepares. A measure of quality control was effected by checking the responses against a sample of the finding aid in question. In total, 874 responses were entered into a database and analyzed for the purposes of the study. A copy of the questionnaire with attendant instructions appears in Appendix B.

B. ANALYZING THE QUESTIONNAIRE

To analyze the returns, it was necessary to quantify as much data as possible. Admittedly, quantification of information about such a qualitative and individualistic exercise as the preparation of finding aids is bound to be somewhat subjective. A program was written to operate under the Stanford Public Information REtrieval System (SPIRES) in use at the University of British Columbia to aid analysis of the various elements of the responses. Sixteen data fields were created, for the most part corresponding to single questions in the questionnaire. In designing the questionnaire, it became evident that a great many technical terms used in the arrangement and description of archives are neither adequately defined nor consistently applied. Rather than delay the work by a lengthy discussion of terminology, and in order to find out just which terms are being used in

Canadian archives, the Group chose not to append a rigid set of definitions to the questionnaire. Instead, terms judged to be in common use were chosen. In addition, some general guidelines were developed to help people interpret the questionnaire (see Appendix B). Once the responses came in, it became a matter of analyzing the returns consistently by rationalizing terminological confusions when they became apparent. To ensure consistency in the final results, a brief definition of certain data fields was developed. The definitions and a list of all data fields appear in Appendix C.

As serious as the problem of terminology is, there were other difficulties in analyzing descriptive practices. Basically, those difficulties derive from the condition of Canadian archives and Canadian archival education. The Consultative Group on Canadian Archives reported in 1980 that the resources of many institutions are woefully inadequate to carry out even the most basic descriptive programs, and the situation is probably little improved today.[1] Furthermore, many archivists have had little or no formal training. In such circumstances, methodology, if it is learned at all, is handed down as institutional practice from generation to generation, from repository to repository, and from archivist to archivist. In many cases, practice is not even consistent within repositories, where the construction of finding aids depends very much on the habits of individual archivists and the idiosyncrasies of the materials being described.

Particular questions proved difficult to answer. For one thing, it seems surprisingly difficult for many archivists, including those on the Working Group, to prepare a succinct and informative statement of the purpose of the particular finding aid. A common answer merely reflected that the purpose of the finding aid was to describe the materials. These uninformative responses may be further evidence of

1. *Canadian Archives: Report to the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada by the Consultative Group on Canadian Archives* (Ottawa, 1980), Ch. III, *passim*.

inadequate training in archival theory so that archivists follow the procedures they learned on the job without a clear understanding of the underlying principles.

A related question probed the relationships among various finding aids. It is a quality of many archival finding aids that they do not stand alone. Any given search may progress from one finding aid to others before the search is completed. The relationship of one finding aid to another frequently explains, at least in part, the very purpose of one or another or both, something which often eluded the respondent describing the purpose of the finding aid. Even when describing relationships among finding aids, many respondents simply explained how researchers had to behave to use the finding aids rather than how the aids were functionally related. Many systems or so-called systems of finding aids would seem to have grown on an *ad hoc* rather than a planned basis. Evidently, they *can* be made to work together, but they are not consciously created as part of an integrated system of finding aids.

A third area of investigation probed the thorny matter of levels of arrangement. Archivists consistently work on the assumption that arrangement and description are closely related. Indeed, many finding aids are designed to reveal arrangement. Moreover, archivists consciously gear certain finding aids to a particular level or levels of arrangement. To penetrate just which levels in the arrangement of archival materials were described in each type of finding aid, respondents were asked to analyze which of the five levels (repository, *fonds*, series, unit, or item) were recorded in the particular type of finding aid in question. This is obviously a very complex issue.

To cope with the problem of levels, a two-part analysis was required, one part focusing on the scope of the finding aid as a whole, and the other recording the level(s) described within the finding aid. For example, a typical inventory of government records describes all the records in a record group, but within the inventory, records series are de-

scribed. An inventory of manuscript personal papers describes the *fonds*, but it may also describe series and possibly even filing units and items. Making this distinction assisted in achieving a more meaningful analysis. Nevertheless, determining the levels remained a difficult problem. An important element of any consistently applied practice will likely involve linking particular levels of arrangement with a particular type of finding aid.

These then are some of the problems involved in analyzing the responses. Such factors should be borne in mind when reading the results of the study.

C. RESULTS OF THE STUDY

1. General Patterns

At the outset, the Working Group determined to study all types of finding aids created in all types of repositories for all types of archival materials. Nine types of finding aids were identified, some of which were subdivided.

Types of finding aid	*Sub-types*
1. accession register	none
2. guide	repository guide
	thematic guide
3. inventory	none
4. catalogue	none
5. location file	none
6. list	item list
	file list
	box list
	descriptive list
7. index	name index
	subject index
	geographical index
	chronological index
8. calendar	none
9. other	none

The returns revealed nine types of archival material:

1. government/corporate records
2. manuscripts
3. photographs
4. maps
5. architectural archives
6. moving image material
7. sound recordings
8. machine-readable records
9. prints, paintings and drawings

Identification of the type of finding aid and the type or types of material for which it is produced made it possible to analyze types of finding aids across the spectrum of archival materials or for single types of material. Extracting statistics of either sort proved simple using SPIRES. Type of finding aid and type of material or record are the two fields which proved most useful when organizing the data. Although such statistical patterns as can be adduced from this analysis are very general and disguise many important peculiarities, they are nonetheless revealing.

a. types of finding aids

In sheer numerical terms, the most commonly created type of finding aid is the index. If the indexing function of catalogues classifies them as a kind of index, then indexes constitute nearly half the finding aids created by Canadian repositories, and that does not take into account indexing done as part of other finding aids such as guides or inventories. The subject index is the most common type of index, which apparently indicates subject access is a major preoccupation of most repositories.

Inventories represent 10 per cent of the total number of finding aids, which is less than one might expect. If, however, inventories are categorized as a specialized type of list, lists of all kinds amount to about 30 per cent of the total. The functions of listing and indexing can therefore be said to characterize archival description. Of course, our data did not reveal anything about the amount of time and effort devoted to lists as compared to indexes, but it may be sup-

posed that many repositories devote more time to listing than to indexing holdings.

Another specialized type of list, the guide, is infrequently produced by Canadian repositories. Sixteen repository guides, some of them covering more than one type of record, were reported from Quebec repositories and only seventeen from the rest of the country. Only four repositories reported producing any kind of thematic guide. Actual practice then belies the assumption sometimes made by archivists that a primary means of subject access to archives is through thematic guides as opposed to forms of subject indexing. The paucity of guides in general seems to indicate that most repositories do not maintain for either internal or external use an up-to-date general listing of *fonds* for all types or any particular type of records. If a prime aim of description of archives is to inform researchers of the general nature of the holdings of archival repositories, the lack of guides seriously undermines any pretensions of realizing that goal.

b. purpose and use

About two-thirds of the finding aids are prepared to facilitate research access to archives, although significant description is undertaken to facilitate administrative operations. The study did not probe the relationship between the two objectives, but it is quite clear that effective and efficient programs of description subsume the means to accomplish both goals.

Well over half the types of finding aids reported had a significant relationship with another type of finding aid. Curiously, only one-third of the finding aids acknowledged as being related actually indicate to users their specific relationship to other finding aids. Apparently, archivists are accustomed to intervene in the search process to aid researchers to understand these relationships. The failure to identify and report the relationships among the various types of finding aids produced by archives constitutes a serious flaw

systems design which undoubtedly hampers researchers' effective access to the information in archives.

c. levels

A significant majority of finding aids, about two-thirds, concentrate on revealing information about archives at the *fonds* level. That is, the whole finding aid (or, for such finding aids as catalogues, the main entry) describes a *fonds*. Of course, an up-to-date catalogue would in total reveal the entire holdings, but anyone trying to use a catalogue in the place of an inventory to assemble information about the complex administrative history of record groups and the like will rarely find it satisfactory.

An insignificant number of finding aids describe series and units as isolated elements, although a significant proportion (about one-quarter) describe items. When it comes to description of the documents within *fonds*, the item level is then the most common (well over half), and filing units and series are frequently described. Lists are commonly constructed so as to describe more than one level, as are even certain catalogue entries. On the basis of current practice, then, it is not possible to see any general pattern in the way archives treat the matter of levels in their descriptive instruments. Indeed, it is not certain whether conscious identification of the various levels is made during the construction of finding aids. Most often, inventories and lists seem to conform to the idiosyncrasies of organization imposed on the records by the creator or the archivist without much regard for archival theory. At most, it can be supposed that more careful attention to systematic arrangement would help archives standardize descriptive processes.

d. descriptive elements

In this area, it is perhaps best to state the number of returns for each of the data elements listed in the questionnaire. The total number of returns is 874.

Data element	*No.*	*Per cent*
call number	675	87
title	601	69
name of creator	483	55
principal occupation	135	15
birth and death dates	154	18
place of residence	132	15
biographical/historical sketch	116	13
form of material	397	45
quantity (extent)	387	44
originals or copies	211	24
location of originals	74	8
inclusive dates of material	583	66
description (scope and content note)	499	57
arrangement	105	12
language	61	7
index terms	273	31
provenance	316	36
restrictions	213	24
reference to other finding aids	153	18
physical condition of documents	91	10
date of preparation of finding aid	175	20

The most commonly used elements (200 or more) are: call number, title[1] and/or name of creator, form of material, quantity or extent, inclusive dates, descriptive note, index terms, and provenance or source. Many of these common elements are captured regardless of the type of finding aid, type of record, and level of description. It might be noted here that the term "form of material" was interpreted in two ways. Some respondents undoubtedly interpreted form to mean physical form (that is, manuscript, photograph, and so forth). Others interpreted form to mean functional or record form, (that is, correspondence, diaries, ledgers, minutes,

1. Clearly, some repositories refer to "title" not in the library sense but as the corporate or personal name of the creator of the records.

and so forth. Archivists have not worked out generally accepted terminology to distinguish form as related to medium from form as related to function.

The degree of detail contained in any given type of finding aid was also analyzed. Nearly 40 per cent of all the finding aids identified from one to five data elements, and approximately another 40 per cent from six to ten. Elements which are included tend to contain data which is imprecise. There is little evidence that rules or guidelines are being used to direct archivists in selecting data elements or in formulating their content.

e. control documents

Two-thirds of all the responses indicated that there was no form of control over the preparation of the type of finding aid in question. A minority of finding aids are produced pursuant to either published or in-house standards. As might be expected, the published standard most commonly used is AACR2.

With inventories, guides, and other specialized archival finding aids, the use of standards is restricted to procedural manuals or guidelines, none of which has been published. By default, those repositories wishing instruction in the preparation of inventories, for instance, must look for published manuals from the United States or other countries.

The most common list of subject headings used by Canadian archives is the *Library of Congress Subject Headings*. Use of *Canadian Subject Headings* and *Répertoire de vedettes-matière* and *Canadiana Authorities* is rare. The vast majority of subject indexing is uncontrolled by any authority, either published or in-house. Similarly, existing name authorities are rarely consulted and few in-house authorities have been developed.

The larger and better-established repositories have a greater tendency to use either published or in-house standards. However, even they seem to control descriptive and indexing practices through systematized means far less often than might be expected. With few exceptions, there seems to

be little familiarity with existing standards and little evidence of repositories developing their own.

f. format

Some 60 per cent of finding aids are in paper form and 35 per cent in card form. The number of automated finding aids is small. A total of only forty responses reported some computer application in the production of finding aids.

g. dissemination

Well under 10 per cent of of the responses indicated that the type of finding aid was as a matter of policy disseminated beyond the repository for external use. The figures do not take into account individual copies of finding aids which are disseminated upon request. By and large, the failure to publish information about archival holdings probably contributes to the commonly held notion that things are "squirreled away" in archives.

2. Types of Finding Aids

The analysis of the returns relating types of finding aids to types of records reveals a few salient patterns.

a. guides

Too few guides were reported to make many useful generalizations. As already noted, the major revelation is the very paucity of guides in existence. Most guides are produced by well-funded public archives, are disseminated for external use, detail other related finding aids, and concentrate on the main data elements as indicated previously. Few are controlled by any standard.

b. catalogues

Over half the returns relevant to this type reported that the catalogue was created pursuant to no rules, authorities or other standards, a surprising result given the fact that

archival catalogues are a direct borrowing from librarianship. The detailed analysis later in this chapter of the returns as related to types of record bears out the suspicion that uncontrolled cataloguing is inconsistent cataloguing.

c. accession registers

Several points are worth noting about accession registers. Many small repositories keep a single accession register for all types of records. Few large repositories have a means of central accessioning, which is noteworthy given the relatively large proportion of accessions containing more than one type of record whose receipt should be accurately recorded in total in a single accession entry.

Most accession registers record information about the *fonds*, but a significant number detail series. Most of the main data elements captured in other finding aids are in fact captured in the accession record, no doubt in many cases tentatively and subject to revision as the material is arranged and stored.

Many respondents feel that accessioning is standardized because they record information about each accession on a form. On the whole, however, analyzing the returns and looking at the samples leaves the impression that accession records are hardly regarded as a form of description at all. They are cryptic and apparently rarely used as a first line of access to the materials. They often merely record that a vague quantity of something was received from somewhere.

d. inventories

For the purposes of analysis, a finding aid qualified as an inventory only if it met the definition given in the Society of American Archivists' (SAA) glossary (see Appendix C). Inventories are prepared mostly for manuscripts and government records, although they are not unknown for other types of documents. Inventories are the means of describing the general nature of voluminous bodies of textual records.

With very few exceptions, they are prepared for *fonds*. A large proportion describe series, as is the case with government records inventories, and a great many provide some sort of listing of other levels in the arrangement of the records. In the classical inventory which describes records only to the series level, there is often a related list of files or items. Many archives also index their inventories or the records described in the inventories. About two-thirds of the repositories reporting an inventory program profess that a relationship exists between the inventory and some other finding aid(s). Inventories are on the whole more detailed than many other finding aids. Well over half the inventories contain more than ten of the data elements on our list. About one-third of the respondents reported having some control document to guide inventory preparation. Overall, the preparation of inventories seems to be a relatively structured exercise. Evidently, the passing on of methodology for the preparation of inventories has produced a more or less standard model.

e. lists

It is not possible to say much about the great variety of lists for which we received returns. For the most part, they provide a description of the contents of *fond*s or series, box by box, file by file, or item by item. Archivists are undoubtedly prolific listers because such lists facilitate location of particular parts or documents in large bodies of records. A few key elements (call number, title/name of creator, form of material, quantity, dates, and descriptive note) predominate.

f. indexes

Archival indexing is almost as free-form as archival listing. Less than half the indexing done in Canadian archives is controlled by authorities. Many indexes contain terms related to several levels of arrangement. More than half the indexing is at the item level, although this is because the summary figures cover all media, and, as earlier noted, non-

textual materials lend themselves to item-level description. A surprising number of indexes bear no detectable relationship to other finding aids, presumably because they are indexes which provide direct access to individual files or documents. From the available evidence, there appear to be very few general, cumulative indexes prepared on a consistent basis using authority files or a controlled vocabulary.

There are undoubtedly both methodological and technical reasons for all this. Much searching in archives is provenance-based, so many archives shun content indexing, although even then one might expect to see more name access points than is evident. Furthermore, archivists are often struggling to achieve minimal descriptions of large and varied bodies of records. In the face of such difficulties, the time-consuming and exacting exercise of indexing becomes a sometime thing indifferently practised when it is done.

3. Finding Aids Related to Type of Record

a. government records

The most common finding aid produced for government records is the inventory for record groups. The typical government record inventory provides description of records series in the record group. Rarely does the inventory itself contain file or item descriptions, but many inventories are complemented by container listings. Only the Public Archives of Canada has published inventories on a regular basis.

Half the repositories holding government records reported having a procedural manual to guide archivists preparing inventories. None of these manuals has been published. The content and format of government records inventories vary widely. Four-fifths of them tend to detail the administrative history of the record group and agencies within it. Otherwise, the most common descriptive elements in inventories are: call number; form of material; inclusive dates; series description; transferring agency; and restric-

tions. Despite the fact that much effort is expended in producing inventories, and despite evidence that a fairly standard methodology of inventory construction is widely accepted, the variations in the kinds of information inventories actually portray and in the formats in which that information is presented must make it difficult for researchers to interpret inventories from repository to repository. Standard practice in this regard is not beyond the capacity of archives, as the existence of procedure manuals attests.

Six repositories reported that they catalogue government records. Catalogue entries are brief, usually containing only call number, name of creating agency, quantity, dates, series or other description, and, in about half the cases, reference to other finding aids. Catalogues frequently act as indexes to inventories. Few of the government record catalogues studied were highly developed. More often, it seems, repositories have opted for name and/or subject indexes rather than catalogues to facilitate access to inventories or directly to records. Several repositories reported having special indexes to particular series.

b. manuscripts

There are some significant differences in the types of finding aids for manuscripts produced in Quebec as opposed to the rest of Canada. Description of manuscripts outside Quebec is dominated by the inventory (or register) and the catalogue (of which some 40 per cent act as an index to inventories). Quebec repositories eschew the catalogue in favour of some form of index. Inventories and lists taken together for the whole country comprise more than 40 per cent of the reported returns, and it should be recognized that many manuscript inventories in fact contain detailed listings of one form or another.

Many repositories have indexes combining name and subject entries or maintain two separate indexes for names and subjects, when they do not have a catalogue. Quebec repositories also more commonly keep a guide to manuscript

collections than do those in the rest of the country. Of course, manuscript catalogues, when up to date, provide summary descriptions of the entire holdings. So in a sense it is a case of each tradition choosing a different instrument to serve the purpose of maintaining summary descriptions of manuscript collections.

In manuscript cataloguing in English Canada, the unit of entry is uniformly the manuscript collection or *fonds*. In a majority of cases, entries usually describe record series. A few repositories analyze files or items within *fonds* and prepare entries for them, but it is more common to see entries for single items only when they constitute a discrete accession and are in effect the whole *fonds*. Roughly two-thirds of the repositories preparing catalogues reported having some form of standardization in their production. Only two repositories have taken advantage of automation in their cataloguing of manuscripts.

As for data elements, catalogue entries most commonly (more than half of returns) capture call number, title/name of creator, form of material, quantity, dates of material, and descriptive note. By comparison, more than half of the inventories for manuscripts capture call number, title/name of creator, principal occupation, place of residence, birth and death dates, biographical/historical sketch, form of material, quantity, dates of material, scope and content note, and provenance.

Inventories are controlled about 40 per cent of the time by some sort of manual. The fact that individual repositories recognize the need to standardize the preparation of inventories suggests that both their contents and format can be standardized across repositories.

c. photographs

Catalogues, lists and indexes dominate the field of description of photographs. No repository or thematic guides to photographs were reported. Nine returns reported the existence of inventories of photographs.

It was difficult to categorize many finding aids to photographs. Many finding aids called inventories were little more than lists which describe items, although a significant minority of repositories, a majority of which are in Quebec, maintain a list describing photograph *fonds*. On the whole, lists capture virtually the same information as do other finding aids. Most indexes are by subject, about half of which are controlled by some form of authority.

d. maps

Most maps held by Canadian archives are in fact published items. Surprisingly, most repositories do not adopt the catalogue as their main finding aid. Only 15 per cent of the returns reported catalogues, and less than half of those followed existing standards. Indexes and lists constitute half the returns. A few repositories, mostly in Quebec, maintain inventories for maps. Three Quebec repositories also maintained guides, and several other Quebec repositories listed maps in general guides.

Overall, for all types of finding aids, the most common data elements are: call number, title, author, form of material, quantity, date, and descriptive note. In addition, publisher and dimension occurred most often because of the published nature of the material, and scale is commonly given because of the nature of cartographic material.

In sum, then, with Quebec practice excepted, it might be said that repositories have adopted neither the library model based on standardized bibliographic description nor the archival model based on the guide and inventory with arrangement into record groups. For most repositories, the volume and itemized nature of cartographic materials as well as inadequate staffing levels have meant that rough and ready descriptive techniques have been adopted of necessity.

e. moving image material

Like maps, many films and videotapes are in fact published items. Moving image material is rather more prevalent in archives in Canada than might be expected, given the

expense of properly caring for it. Twenty-two repositories reported moving image holdings. A total of forty-eight finding aids were reported for these materials.

Many repositories simply maintain a list of film and videotape holdings, although eight maintain a catalogue and another eight report indexes, usually to subjects. In half the instances, catalogues describe *fonds*, but most entries give information about individual films. Catalogues are frequently used in conjunction with other finding aids, usually lists of some kind. Fully half the catalogues have no controls over method of preparation.

Many of the common elements captured for other materials have a corresponding element for films and videotapes, but a high percentage of the returns listed one or more added elements related to production, distribution, and physical description (colour, projection speed, playing time), all of which are adequately accounted for in existing library descriptive rules.

Only three repositories keep inventories of films on the basis of *fonds*. Three guides were also reported.

f. sound recordings

Probably because of the prevalence of oral history tapes, sound recordings are more common in Canadian repositories than films and video recordings. Catalogues and lists dominate the returns. There are, remarkably, five guides to sound recordings, one of them actually a province-wide guide, virtually the only such guide ever produced in Canada as far as can be determined. The catalogues are quite faithfully constructed by adapting library rules, and they tend to have entries for *fonds*, often with items also described within the entry or in separate entries. Two-thirds use some form of rules in their construction.

The most common data elements are: call number, title, author, form, quantity, dates, descriptive note, and such additional elements as interviewer/interviewee, speed, and playing time.

g. machine-readable records

Too few repositories reported having finding aids for machine-readable archives to allow any meaningful generalization, and of those, only the Public Archives of Canada has a well-developed descriptive program. Outside PAC, only Quebec repositories reported having custody of machine-readable archives, and then often as part of a combined archives and records management service.

h. architectural archives

Seventeen repositories reported a total of twenty-eight finding aids for architectural archives. Only four catalogues were reported, none of them based on any standard. All catalogues have entries at the level of *fonds* and usually describe major subgroups or series. Inventories are less prevalent. The most common type of finding aid is the index. Repositories are striving to provide access by such characteristics as name of architect, type of building, and even functional form of record through indexes, none of which is controlled by a published standard. A strong case can be made for archivists developing their own standards for architectural archives.

i. prints, paintings, and drawings

Seven catalogues were reported, all but one constructed with entries at the item level, and only one based on existing published cataloguing rules. Probably because holdings of most repositories are not extensive, the most common type of finding aid, reported by fifteen repositories, is a simple list. Seven of the eight reported that indexes were not controlled by either published or unpublished authorities. No inventories were reported.

C2

D. CONCLUSION

The analysis of the production of finding aids in Canadian repositories confirms one thing above all else: descriptive and indexing practice is highly idiosyncratic. Despite the inability of many repositories to muster adequate resources for descriptive programs, there is ample evidence that greater familiarity with and use of standards of all kinds will reap benefits for both archivists and users alike, those benefits in general being greater effectiveness and efficiency in the use of available resources for the archivist and greater intelligibility for the user, especially as the user moves from repository to repository in the course of a search. Despite this somewhat disturbing conclusion, the analysis also demonstrates conclusively that, in one way or another, archivists capture virtually the same types of information about their holdings, no matter the type of record or the type of descriptive finding aid. The application of standards involves more a dictating how that information is captured and displayed than a wholesale change in what information is captured. Keeping that in mind, the Group has endeavoured in its recommendations to build on the existing strengths of current practice and add only those elements to it which seem vital to the improvement of descriptive practice.

4

Toward Descriptive Standards

Standardizing descriptive and indexing practices resolves itself into two separate but related realms. In the first place, the principles and concepts on which practice is based must be fixed and the profession widely informed of them. This need has long been a concern of the archival profession and explains the perennial efforts to write manuals of one kind or another. Throughout its deliberations and study, the Working Group has wrestled with certain of the theoretical issues affecting archival description. Despite the temptation to indulge in lengthy theoretical discussion, we have tried to rest our recommendations on concepts and assumptions which we believe are already widely agreed upon in the archival community. Where unresolved issues or problems exist, we have either offered solutions or acknowledged the complexities involved and identified areas for further study.

In the second place, standardizing practice involves developing a broad range of tools to guide archivists in the process of describing and indexing archives. In this area, one goal of the Working Group has been to articulate just where such tools are needed, what their purpose is, and what is involved in creating them. Our deliberations have demonstrated that the range and complexity of the required standards defy simple solution. Indeed, the Working Group did endeavour to develop a basic, overarching standard to guide descriptive practice. In the end, we had to accept that no

single standard could be made to apply to the broad range of archival materials and finding aids without being so general as to be meaningless. We could only present an exposition of the magnitude of the problems and construct a set of recommendations to develop solutions through further work in a number of areas.

The Working Group has consciously placed the question of standardizing archival description and indexing in the context of international developments in the archival and bibliographical communities. There is no doubt that archivists have their own specialized needs in this area, but we are convinced that Canadian archivists can gain much from adopting and adapting standards already developed elsewhere. In our view, there is no danger in taking such a position, provided that archivists articulate their needs and develop additional standards to meet those needs where existing standards are not adequate or acceptable.

A. PRINCIPLES AND CONCEPTS

Aside from the host of problems to which archivists fall heir through bad record-keeping practice by the creators of archives, most of the problems inherent in the application of provenance may be attributed to the difficulty of defining and determining what constitutes a *fonds* for practical purposes, particularly in complex bureaucratic environments which are subject to frequent administrative change. To meet this problem, archivists have determined that the describable unit of archival work will vary according to the nature and extent of the documents in their care and the needs of the users of the documents. To an extent, this is as it should be. The particular situation of the repository must always be taken into account in the development of a descriptive program but *not* at the expense of the principle of provenance, which dictates that the origin, nature, and extent of *fonds* be accurately reported in finding aids.

One may take a maximalist or a minimalist approach to the question of defining *fonds*, as the French archivist Michel Duchein has suggested.[1] In some areas of archival work, the issue is straightforward because most accessions consist of closed *fonds* (that is, no further accruals are expected), generated by a single agency or person and bearing on a single function or activity. For instance, many manuscript and photographic accessions are so characterized. In such cases, the whole *fonds* is a convenient describable unit. It is not, however, so easy to describe all the documents created and accumulated by corporate bodies such as a government department and to define in a standard manner which documents constitute a *fonds*. *Fonds* (or archival groups) of such sort may be broken down into one or more *sous-fonds* (or sub-groups) which in turn may be divided until the smallest unit of records-creating administration is reached. A system of arrangement and description concentrating on a whole department (or even larger entity) takes a maximalist position. A system focusing on the smallest sub-unit of administration (and often on the series created by each sub-unit) takes a minimalist position. Whatever position is taken by the repository, the important thing is to provide accurate description of all *fonds*.

> (1) We recommend that, as a priority, Canadian archivists describe and index holdings at the level of *fonds*, regardless of the form or medium of the records.

This prime recommendation has certain implicit consequences. It encourages repositories to develop the means of summary description of *fonds* before proceeding to detailed description at other levels. Such a summary description allows repositories to produce such guides, catalogues, inventories, and lists as are appropriate. It also encourages repositories to treat all records regardless of their form or medium

1. Michel Duchein, "Theoretical Principles and Practical Problems of *Respect des fonds* in Archival Science," *Archivaria* 16 (Summer 1983): 69.

in the same manner, and, in particular, to develop a single description of multi-media *fonds*.

Far from believing that our first recommendation is in any way radical, we judge that it is a logical outcome of the careful observance of the principle of provenance which archivists profess to uphold. Moreover, we believe that a standard for describing *fonds* can be developed. We envisage something akin to the General International Standard Bibliographic Description (ISBD(G)) being developed for archives, from which specialized standards may be developed for each medium. To achieve this end, the appropriate international bodies must be involved.

> (2) We recommend that the Bureau of Canadian Archivists ask the International Congress on Archives and the International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions jointly to develop and seek approval for international standards for the description of *fonds d'archives*.

Lest our readers believe that we have recommended a total merging of the archival and bibliographic traditions, we reiterate that archival description must proceed from a thorough understanding of the concepts and practices of archival arrangement, which give all processes of administrative and intellectual control of archives their distinctive character.

The broadest level of archival arrangement is that of the repository, when, for example, separate sections or divisions are created to handle archives in a particular form or medium (such as manuscripts or photographs), or from a particular source (such as public records or private manuscripts). The next level of arrangement is the *fonds*. Each *fonds*, however it is determined, will have one or more series, which comprise

> file units or documents arranged in accordance with a filing system or maintained as a unit because they relate to

a particular subject or function, result from the same activity, have a particular form, or because of some other relationship arising out of their creation, receipt, or use.[1]

Series are, given the definition of them, composed of filing units. A file or filing unit is simply "an accumulation of records maintained in a predetermined physical arrangement"[2]; an arrangement which may be determined by the repository if one is not detected in the records. Filing units are made up of items, which are "the smallest units of record material which accumulate to form file units and series."[3] An item is not necessarily a single leaf or sheet of paper. It may be composed of several sheets, as a report, memorandum, or brief, or be a reel, book, volume, or so on. It is, to borrow from the French terminology, "an indivisible archival unit,"[4] by reason of its creation. A common understanding of this matter is essential both to clarify discussion of questions of arrangement and to facilitate precise communication among archives.

> (3) We recommend that Canadian archivists formally recognize five levels of the arrangement of archives: repository, *fonds*, series, filing unit, and item.

These levels of arrangement are revealed in and determine the nature of finding aids. For instance, guides are geared to the repository level and have as entries descriptions of *fonds*. Likewise, inventories are geared to the *fonds* level and have as entries descriptions of series. There are, however, seven levels of the description of archives, because

1. Frank B. Evans, *et al.*, comps., "A basic glossary for archivists, manuscript curators and records managers," *American Archivist* 37 (July 1974): 430.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 422.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 424.
4. *Elsevier's lexicon of archive terminology* (New York: Elsevier, 1964), p. 3.

archives from more than one repository may be described in a single finding aid, such as a union list, and description of several fonds may be grouped by reason of their affinity for research or other purposes in a single finding aid. The notion of levels of description helps archivists define the purpose, coverage, and constituents of finding aids in relation to their total descriptive aims and program.

> (4) We recommend that Canadian archivists formally recognize seven levels of description: inter-institutional, repository, thematic group, *fonds*, series, filing unit, and item.

An important principle of archival descriptive work can be derived from consideration of the concept of levels of description. We have already recommended (no. 1) that archivists first control and describe their holdings at the general level of *fonds*. Inherent in such advice is the notion that all descriptive work proceed from the general to the specific. The volume of archival holdings alone has pushed archivists in this direction, but there is principled reasoning for so proceeding. For most users, the general character of the holdings must be understood before they search the specific constituents of archival groupings. Specific description of items or files without adequate description of series and *fonds* ultimately obscures the context in which the items and files were created.

> (5) We recommend that the organization of descriptive work proceed from the more general to the more specific levels of description.

One more concept of level must be introduced. In producing any archival description, it is possible to give more or less detail. The concept of level of detail in bibliographic description is well established and is incorporated, for instance, in AACR2 in rule 1.0D. The same concept can be applied to many facets of archival description. Determining levels of detail of description involves specifying the range of elements or information to be captured in particular descrip-

tions or particular types of finding aids. As such, the concept can usefully be built into many standards, as indeed it has been in Steven Hensen's *Archives, Personal Papers and Manuscripts*.[1]

(6) We recommend that flexible standards incorporating the concept of level of detail of description be developed whenever possible.

B. GENERAL DESCRIPTIVE STANDARDS

So far, our recommendations have dealt with principles and concepts rather than with the precise matter of standards. To repeat our earlier caveat, we are not about to lay down a battery of standards for operational purposes; rather we aim to characterize the work required in order to guide the Canadian archival community in the development, adoption, and implementation of standards of description and indexing.

The first and most general task is to define the types of finding aids produced by Canadian archives. Something of this order has been done in *Les instruments de recherche pour les archives*.[2] The key concept in this volume is the notion of levels of description. Generally speaking, there is a type of finding aid appropriate to each level of description. For example, a guide (or *guide de dépôt)* contains descriptions of all *fonds* held by a repository and is therefore geared to the repository level of description. A catalogue *(catalogue des fonds)* in fact serves the same purpose. There is little essential difference in the construction of entries *(notices)* found in guides or catalogues at the repository level. It should be

1. Published documents referred to throughout these recommendations are fully cited at the end of Chapter 2.
2. Louis Cardinal, *et al., Les instruments de recherche pour les archives* (La Pocatière, Quebec, 1984).

noted that some types of finding aids contain within them descriptions of documents at more than one level of *arrangement*. For example, in English-speaking Canada and in the United States, inventories are constructed for *fonds* but may contain description of documents at one or more of the levels of sub-group *(sous-fonds)*, series *(série)*, filing unit *(article)*, or, rarely, item *(pièce)*.

As our study of current practice revealed, it is difficult to determine the type of finding aid from the name given to it because different repositories call a single type of finding aid by a variety of names. In order to standardize the practice of producing finding aids of all kinds, it is necessary to arrive at a common name for each type and to set out its contents and format. The following table lists the main types of finding aids as related to each of the seven levels of description. There may be more types of finding aids than we suggest in the table; certainly, *Les instruments de recherche pour les archives* details several types of lists at the levels of filing unit *(article)* and item *(pièce)*. As well, we suspect that it will become necessary to develop a standard for the description of series *(série)* to accommodate the needs of repositories holding large volumes of public or corporate records. Currently, descriptions of series are a component of finding aids geared to the levels of *fonds* or repository.

LEVEL OF DESCRIPTION	TYPE OF FINDING AID	
	English	*French*
inter-institutional	union list/ catalogue	guide/catalogue collectif
repository	guide	guide de dépôt
	catalogue	catalogue des *fonds*
		état général des *fonds*
thematic group	thematic guide	guide par groupe de *fonds*
fonds	inventory	guide par *fonds*
series	none	aucun
filing unit	list	répertoire
item	list	inventaire

The task of defining finding aids therefore involves:

i) naming each type,
ii) stating its purpose,
iii) characterizing its contents, and
iv) establishing a format for its presentation.

We envisage two stages in the characterization of the contents of each type of finding aid. In the first stage, it is necessary to define the major components. For example, a guide is usually composed of a preface, an explanatory introduction, and a listing of *fonds;* an inventory is usually composed of some or all of the following: preface, introduction, biographical sketch/agency history, scope and content note, series description, and detailed listings of some sort. In the second stage, the elements of the actual descriptions of records may be further defined and their format established. The final product will constitute a definitive standard for all Canadian repositories to follow when producing the particular type of finding aid in question. All such standards should incorporate the concept of levels of detail of description whenever possible.

(7) We recommend that all types of finding aids regularly produced by Canadian archival repositories be defined in standards which would give a name to the type of finding aid in question, state its purpose, characterize its contents, and establish a format for its presentation.

One of the most troubling aspects of work in the area of the description of archives is the lack of an adequate glossary of technical terms, particularly with regard to the data elements used in composing archival descriptive finding aids. Work in this area is essential for the transition from manual to automated systems.

(8) We recommend that the Bureau of Canadian Archivists strike a special committee to study the data

element dictionary produced during the work of the National Information Systems Task Force of the Society of American Archivists and the data standard for computerized archival description developed by the Methods of Listing Working Party of the Society of Archivists in the United Kingdom to determine their usefulness and applicability to the overall development of descriptive standards for Canadian archives.

It is almost certain that a Canadian data element standard *and* a comprehensive glossary of technical terms will have to be worked out as part of the process of developing standards, if only to address our bilingual needs.

C. SPECIFIC DESCRIPTIVE STANDARDS

The foregoing recommendations have been of a general nature, applicable to all types and formats of archival holdings. However, because particular physical forms have specialized needs, and because standards development is more advanced in some areas than in others, the Group feels that specific recommendations addressing these specialized needs are appropriate.

1. Textual Archives

Much of the professional literature written in North America makes a distinction between archives (or public records) and manuscripts. Yet existing descriptive conventions contain many identical or comparable elements. For example, the historical sketch in an inventory describing the records of a government department is equivalent to the biographical information included in a description of a manuscript *fonds*. Thus, the Group believes that the standards for description of textual archives, whatever their provenance, could be developed in concert. This coincides

73

with the position taken in Steven Hensen's manual *Archives, Personal Papers and Manuscripts,* which expands and develops the rules for describing manuscript material in Chapter 4 of AACR2. Hensen has broadened the rules for description at the *fonds* level to apply to all textual material. Although rules and standards for description at other levels have yet to be developed, Hensen's rules are a good basis since they are derived from AACR2 and thus are compatible with computer communications formats.

(9) We recommend that government records, corporate records, and manuscripts be considered as one particular type of format for the purposes of developing descriptive standards.

(10) We recommend that the Bureau of Canadian Archivists appoint a committee to develop descriptive standards for textual archives at all levels of description.

(11) We recommend that this committee use Steven Hensen's *Archives, Personal Papers and Manuscripts,* with modifications as appear necessary, as the basis for the development of rules for the summary description of textual archives at the *fonds* level.

2. Cartographic Materials

Because many cartographic materials are published items and therefore fall into the realm of librarianship, development of descriptive standards in this field is by far the most advanced. An international committee working closely with National Map Collection of the Public Archives of Canada and the Association of Canadian Map Libraries produced *Cartographic Materials* in 1982. This manual amplified and elucidated Chapter 3 of AACR2 and has become the standard for description for map libraries and archives in North America. Thus there seems little point in establishing a com-

mittee to focus on standards development in this area.

(12) We recommend that *AACR2* (Chapter 3) and *Cartographic Materials: a Manual of Interpretation for AACR2* be the basis for description of cartographic materials.

3. Architectural Archives

Although limited resources often mean that architectural drawings and related materials are treated as if they were a type of map, the requirements for description of architectural archives are very different. Compared with cartographic materials, descriptive standards for architectural archives are in an embryonic stage, and for this reason much work will be required. In accord with the participants at a seminar on descriptive standards for architectural archives held at the Canadian Centre for Architecture in May 1985, the Group believes that architectural drawings and other records must be distinguished as a class deserving special attention.

(13) We recommend that descriptive standards for architectural archives be developed separately from those for cartographic materials.

(14) We recommend that the Bureau of Canadian Archivists appoint a committee to work closely with the Architectural Drawings Advisory Group to develop standards for the description of architectural archives, and for architectural drawings in particular.

4. Photographs

In contrast to textual archives, the traditional focus of description of photographic material has been the individual image or item rather than groupings such as the *fonds* or ser-

ies. Thus considerable development of descriptive rules for items has taken place, but less developed are guidelines for description of photographic archives at other levels. As is the case with textual and cartographic materials, an interpretive manual based on the relevant chapter of AACR2 has been produced: *Graphic Materials: Rules for Describing Original Items and Collections* by Elisabeth Betz. Betz expands the rules in Chapter 8 of AACR2, which focuses almost exclusively on items, and develops rules for the description of photographic *fonds*.

> (15) We recommend that the Bureau of Canadian Archivists appoint a committee to develop descriptive standards for photographs and collections of photographic materials using Elisabeth Betz's *Graphic Materials*, with modifications as appear necessary, as the basis for such standards.

5. Prints, Paintings and Drawings

Few Canadian archives have extensive documentary art collections. Nevertheless, works of art providing visual historical information about people and places within an institution's acquisitions mandate inevitably find their way into archival collections, and standards are required to describe them. Elisabeth Betz's interpretive manual covers all types of graphic materials and thus should provide a useful basis for descriptive standards in this area.

> (16) We recommend that the Bureau of Canadian Archivists appoint a committee to develop descriptive standards for paintings, prints, drawings and other works of art using Elisabeth Betz's *Graphic Materials*, with modifications as appear necessary, as the basis for such standards.

6. Moving Image Material

Principles of describing individual published films or video recordings, such as features, documentaries, and so forth, are fairly well established in ISBD(NBM), Chapter 7 of AACR2 and *Nonbook Materials* by Jean Weihs *et al.* However, many archival moving image holdings consist of collections of unpublished items such as television broadcasts, feature films, commercials, home movies, and raw footage/outtakes from feature films, as well as the component parts (sound tracks and so forth) of such material. Rules for describing such material are virtually nonexistent, and AACR2 is difficult to apply because much of the information there required is often unknown, unavailable, or irrelevant. A second difficulty is that AACR2 is geared almost exclusively to the item; archival description must be geared to the collection as well, whether it be a collection consisting entirely of film or a multi-media collection which includes film among other types of material. AACR2 seems to be a reasonable basis for the Working Group's recommendations; however, work needs to be done to expand and clarify its applicability to archival holdings. Fortunately, Wendy White-Hensen of the Library of Congress has prepared a cataloguing manual for moving image material which expands and adapts the rules in Chapter 7 of AACR2.

> (17) We recommend that the Bureau of Canadian Archivists appoint a committee to examine and evaluate Wendy White-Hensen's *Archival Moving Image Materials: A Cataloging Manual* as a basis for descriptive standards for moving image material, with modifications as appear necessary.

7. Sound Recordings

The problems of describing sound recordings preserved in archival repositories are similar to those facing archivists trying to describe their moving image holdings. That is,

77

guidelines for the description of published recordings are well established in ISBD(NBM), Chapter 6 of AACR2 and *Nonbook Materials*. However, many archival collections of sound recordings consist of material such as oral history interviews, broadcast material, ceremonies, and so forth which do not fit neatly into the categories covered by existing rules. It is difficult to apply AACR2 to such material because much of the information required by AACR2's areas is unavailable or irrelevant. As well, AACR2 is geared to the item, and archival description requires rules to describe such material at the *fonds* level. The most logical direction in this area would be to expand and adapt Chapter 6 of AACR2 to apply to the broad range of sound material preserved in Canadian archival repositories.

> (18) We recommend that the Bureau of Canadian Archivists appoint a committee to examine existing standards for the description of sound recordings and develop standards which meet the special requirements of the variety of sound recordings held in archival repositories, and co-ordinate the committee's work with efforts in the same direction of the Association for the Study of Canadian Radio and Television.

8. Machine-readable Archives

The issue of description of machine-readable archives has touched relatively few Canadian repositories as yet. However, the relative scarcity of machine-readable archives provides an excellent opportunity to develop standards which can be in place by the time more institutions acquire such material. Already Canadian archivists have been involved in international efforts to establish descriptive standards for machine-readable material. In particular, Canadian archivists have been active in a working group formed by IASSIST (International Association for Social Science Information Service and Technology) which prepared comments on the

cataloguing of machine-readable data files for submission to IFLA. In fact, IFLA has taken over the work of this group and has established a committee to develop an ISBD for machine-readable files. As well, Chapter 9 of AACR2 provides detailed rules for such material and these rules have been supplemented by another interpretive manual — Sue Dodd's *Cataloging Machine-Readable Data Files*.

(19) We recommend that the Bureau of Canadian Archivists appoint a committee to develop standards for machine-readable archives using Chapter 9 of AACR2 and Sue Dodd's *Cataloging Machine-Readable Data Files*, with modifications as appear necessary, as a basis for such standards.

(20) We recommend that this committee take steps to ensure that it is represented on the IFLA working group which is developing an ISBD for machine-readable data files.

9. Non-subject Access Points

The names of persons, corporate bodies, institutions, and organizations serve as very important access points to archival holdings, and their use in catalogues and indexes must be properly controlled. The purpose of name authorities — to ensure that names are used consistently over a variety of indexes in many institutions, and to provide a means to distinguish between persons or corporate bodies with the same name — cannot be questioned. Indeed, the obvious value of such authorities has meant that standards are already well established and readily available. The standards for name authorities are of two sorts: existing compilations of names such as *Canadiana Authorities* or the Library of Congress *Name Authorities*, which are in some standard format and which have been checked for accuracy and consistency; and sets of rules such as AACR2 (Chapters 22-24) to

assist in the establishment of the authorized form of any particular name which is not in an existing compilation.

(21) We recommend that Canadian archivists make use of *Canadiana Authorities* and/or Library of Congress *Name Authorities* whenever possible in building their own name authority files.

(22) We recommend that the rules in AACR2 (Chapters 22-24) be used where appropriate for the formation of personal, corporate, and geographical names where no existing authority listing is available.

(23) We recommend that the Bureau of Canadian Archivists prepare a manual on name authorities discussing the reasons behind them, and explaining the AACR2 rules for names and how to use the most significant existing authorities.

D. SUBJECT INDEXING

The matter of subject indexing is more complex because there is no one set of existing subject headings which is completely satisfactory for the needs of all Canadian archives, and there are no commonly accepted procedures to establish new headings. The best-known lists of headings are *Library of Congress Subject Headings* and *Répertoire de vedettes-matière*. However, a number of more specialized lists of headings, which may be appropriate for archival material, have been developed for particular fields. Thus it is very difficult to recommend any single subject heading authority. In fact, the extensive resources required for indexing and archivists' lack of formal training in indexing theory and methodology make it difficult to make specific recommendations about this matter until we have more information about the use and role of indexes to archival material and the implications

thereof.

(24) We recommend that the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada fund a research study to investigate the issues and problems in indexing archival material as related to the needs of archivists and the users of archives.

(25) We recommend that archival institutions already committed to indexing of their holdings use existing lists of subject headings deemed most appropriate for their needs.

(26) We recommend that institutions which index their holdings prepare cumulative indexes based on consistent procedures and existing subject headings rather than separate indexes for each *fonds*.

E. INFORMATION EXCHANGE

As for the matter of national and regional exchange of information about archival holdings, after much discussion the Group judged that to make recommendations in this regard would go far beyond its mandate to investigate descriptive standards. We do recognize that existing data bases such as the *Union List of Manuscripts in Canadian Repositories* and the *Guide to Canadian Photographic Archives* are a beginning in this area. However, recommendation no. 1, that the first priority of archival information systems should be description of *fonds* regardless of the medium of the record, should encourage developers and compilers of national or regional data bases to accommodate all media of records in their plans. Moreover, the many questions as to the scope of inter-institutional data bases and the means,

both financial and technological, of developing them suggest the need for a thorough investigation in the context of revision of the *Union List of Manuscripts in Canadian Repositories* and the *Guide to Canadian Photographic Archives*.

> (27) We recommend that the Bureau of Canadian Archivists appoint a committee to undertake the necessary research to recommend mechanisms for inter-institutional exchange of archival information.

In the area of communications standards, we have taken note of the good reception which the recently developed US/MARC Archives and Manuscripts Control (AMC) format has received in the United States. This welcome development, in which archivists took a leading role, promises to usher in a new era of archival automation. Canadian archivists will want to keep abreast of developments in this area because MARC AMC is likely to become a widely used standard for institutional storage of archival data as well as a communications format. Indeed, if software capable of accommodating MARC records is developed for microcomputers, as appears possible, a great many institutions may be able to make use of MARC AMC. In time, we look forward to the development of means to accommodate detailed coding of non-textual archival materials in the MARC AMC format by format integration.

> (28) We recommend that a committee be appointed by the Bureau of Canadian Archivists, working in close cooperation with the National Library of Canada and the Canadian Committee on MARC, to examine the US/MARC Archives and Manuscripts Control format and make recommendations about its adoption or adaptation in Canada.

82

F. DEVELOPMENT, ADOPTION, MAINTENANCE, AND IMPLEMENTATION

The establishment of a series of committees to develop various standards is but the first step in the process which includes development, formal adoption, dissemination, education, implementation, and ongoing maintenance. This process will require time and resources, both human and financial. This is amply demonstrated by the attempts to develop standards without the adequate financial resources to hold meetings and discussions away from the daily demands of institutions. The experience of the Working Group amply revealed the complexity of the issue of standards development. Thus recommendations are necessary to identify the resources required and to indicate how they may be deployed in the process of developing a coherent body of descriptive standards to meet Canadian needs. The expertise is certainly available: a number of Canadian archivists are knowledgeable about various aspects of description of particular types of records. The committees can also call on colleagues in other countries and those in related professions for advice. Financial resources are a matter of considerable concern, since at present virtually none is available to support development of standards in the archives field.

> (29) We recommend that the Bureau of Canadian Archivists seek national sources of funding to meet the expenses involved in the development, implementation, and maintenance of descriptive standards for Canadian archival material.

Development, implementation, and maintenance of standards of archival description requires support from the archival institutions which will use them. In this regard, we see a role for the Public Archives of Canada to co-ordinate standards development, a matter which is clearly of pressing national significance.

> (30) We recommend that the Public Archives of Canada establish an office to support the development, implementation, and maintenance of national standards for archival description.

It is obvious from the first part of this chapter that the Group envisages the development of standards through a series of committees appointed by the Bureau of Canadian Archivists. To ensure that the specific standards are compatible with one another and with the relevant international standards in order to facilitate electronic information exchange in the future, a co-ordinating body is necessary, and the Bureau is the most logical choice. While the membership of the various committees will be up to the Bureau, the Group would like to suggest that certain guidelines be followed as much as possible.

> (31) We recommend that the members of the committees whose appointment we have urged on the Bureau of Canadian Archivists be chosen in accordance with the following guidelines: a) committee members should be known to have some expertise in and practical working knowledge of the issue concerned; b) each committee should have at least one representative from the Public Archives of Canada; and c) each committee should, where possible, be regionally based to minimize the high costs of committee meetings.

Development of standards is the first step in the process leading to their eventual use. Before they can be implemented, standards must first be formally approved by bodies with the authority to ratify them. In this case the professional associations are the obvious bodies to grant formal approval of the proposed standards after an appropriate period of discussion. As well, some of the standards may fit into international systems of standards and thus require ratification by an international body, in such a manner as IFLA ratifies the ISBDs.

(32) We recommend that, after a suitable period of discussion in the Canadian archival community, proposed standards be formally approved and adopted by the ACA and AAQ, in conjunction, where appropriate, with the relevant national or international bodies which ratify particular standards.

The other steps in the process — dissemination and maintenance of standards — are closely related in that a central co-ordinating body is required. Once the standards are formally approved, they must be made available in some common format to all potential users. This of course means publication in some form, which in turn involves expense and the need for someone to oversee production, translation, and distribution. Once developed and adopted, standards are subject to questions of interpretation and possibly change as they become more widely used. Thus, supplements and revisions may eventually be required, and a central body is needed to ensure that interim changes and interpretive decisions are maintained in a systematic manner and eventually issued in an update or a revised version of the standard. Where the standard is ratified by an international body, that body may take responsibility for the dissemination/maintenance function, but for the standards developed within Canada, the standards office (proposed in recommendation no. 30) at the Public Archives of Canada would have a role to play.

(33) We recommend that the Public Archives of Canada co-ordinate the publication, translation, distribution/dissemination, maintenance, updating, and revision of adopted standards.

Some effort must be made to familiarize archivists with the details of the new standards to ensure that they are understood and applied consistently. If, as will be the case with most institutions, the adoption of a national standard means

85

changing existing systems and procedures, the educational process must address the problems and alternatives associated with change to a new standard. As each standard is widely accepted and applied, it must become a part of all archival education programs.

(34) We recommend that education in the use of ratified standards be undertaken by the national and regional associations by means of workshops in all parts of the country.

(35) We recommend that curricula of formal archival education programs include extensive reference to ratified standards and how to use them.

The final step in the long process of standards development and use is, of course, implementation. This is a matter which will have to be left to the individual institutions. Certainly the prospect of regional and national networks based on common standards is a powerful incentive to adopt and implement standards. However, the costs of a change in procedures, especially if a retrospective conversion is contemplated, may be daunting in a profession which has traditionally operated with inadequate resources. Unfortunately, the Group does not foresee provision for national assistance to meet implementation costs. Each institution will have to find the necessary resources on its own.

Conclusion

During the time that the Group carried out its deliberations and formulated its report, it was clear that many archivists were awaiting the results with great interest. Some will be disappointed that the recommendations do not include specific standards. It should be clear from the report, however, that the issue of standards is enormously complex, and that any thoughtful consideration of the matter will suggest that those unhappy with the absence of specific standards had unrealistically high expectations.

The Working Group believes that, given the enormity of the task, its recommendations will provide the script for the logical development, dissemination, and implementation of descriptive standards for archival material. Given the vast array and variety of archival descriptive systems and methods currently in place, the Group felt it must first establish a framework based on agreement on certain principles and assumptions basic to any system of archival description. As well, the recommendations establish certain priorities in the development of standards.

Secondly, the Group has recognized the importance of setting up mechanisms and structures within which specific standards can be developed in Canada. Above all, the Group has stressed the need to build on existing standards wherever possible and avoid reinventing the wheel. Although standards are not going to be developed and in place

overnight, the ability to borrow from the not inconsiderable work already available will speed the process immeasurably.

It is now up to Canadian archival institutions, professional associations, and individual archivists to take the necessary steps to carry out the Group's recommendations. This report will be disseminated as widely as possible, and it behooves the archival community to study, discuss, and react to its recommendations as soon as possible.

Institutions have a particular responsibility for the adoption and implementation of standards. If any system of regional (and eventually national) networking is to be achieved, institutions must make a commitment to work towards implementation of this report's recommendations. As the umbrella organization of the two national associations, the Bureau of Canadian Archivists has been deemed the most appropriate body to carry out many of the Group's recommendations. Therefore, the executives of both professional associations must work closely together and keep their members aware of the progress toward the ultimate goal of a system of archival description.

Individual archivists have a responsibility in this as well. Although description of archival holdings has always been central to their work, archivists have too long worked in isolation from each other and from allied professions. They must now become familiar with existing standards so they can better judge their applicability. It is no longer acceptable to plead the uniqueness of archival material as an excuse for eccentric unrelated systems.

When the Working Group started its deliberations, work on the details of a Canadian archival system had barely begun. However, over April-June 1985, the adoption of a number or resolutions by federal, provincial, and territorial archival and government authorities and by ACA and AAQ, and the establishment of the Council of Canadian Archives, promise to bring the Canadian Archival System into being in the near future. Standardization of archival description must be an integral part of this larger formalized system,

and the fact that the publication of the Working Group's report closely follows the inaugural meetings of the Council of Canadian Archives is indeed appropriate. As the actual workings and mandate of the various provincial councils of archives and the Council of Canadian Archives are developed, provision must be made for a commitment to development of a system of descriptive standards in order to facilitate inter-institutional exchange of information.

The Canadian archival community is at the threshold of a unique opportunity to launch the development of descriptive standards. If such standards are to meet our needs and those of our users, action must be taken now. Unless we seize this opportunity, we lose our chance to make automation serve our purposes and to advance the profession. Otherwise, archivists are doomed to rediscover outdated solutions to the perennial problems central to our work.

89

Appendix A

Respondents

Alberni District Historical Society

Alberni Valley Museum

Alcan Museum and Archives

Alexander Graham Bell National Historic Park

Anglican Church of Canada. Diocese of British Columbia

Anglican Church of Canada. Diocese of Ontario

Anglican Church of Canada. Diocese of Ottawa

Anglican Church of Canada. Diocese of Toronto

Anglican Church of Canada. General Synod Archives

Anglican Church of Canada. Provincial Synod of British Columbia.Diocese of New Westminster Archives

Archevêché de Montréal

Archevêché de Rimouski

Archidiocèse d'Ottawa

Archives de la Compagnie de Jésus

Archives Deschâtelets, Oblats de Marie-Immaculée

Archives du Seminaire de Nicolet

Archives nationales du Québec

Archives of Manitoba

Archives of Ontario

Archives of the Canadian Rockies

Archives of the Northwest Territories

Art Gallery of Ontario

Bank of Canada Archives

Bank of Montreal

Bank of Nova Scotia Archives

Beaton Institute of Cape Breton Studies

Bell Canada

Bibliothèque municipale de Montréal

Bibliothèque nationale du Québec

Blacker-Wood Library of Zoology and Ornithology

Brantford Public Library

British Columbia Forest Products Limited

British Columbia Telephone Company

Brothers of the Christian Schools. District of Toronto

Burlington Public Library

Campbell River and District Museum

Canadian Baptist Archives

Canadian Gay Archives

Canadian Mental Health Association

Canadian National Railways

Canadian Opera Company Archives

Capilano College Archives

Centre canadien d'architecture

Centre Stage Company

Cinémathèque québécoise

City of Edmonton Archives

City of Ottawa Archives

City of Richmond Archives

City of Toronto Archives

Clair Historical Society

Clarke Museum and Archives

Collège de Sainte-Anne-de-la-Pocatière

Commission des écoles catholiques de Montréal

Confédération des caisses populaires et d'économie Desjardins du Québec

Dalhousie University Archives

David Thompson University Centre Library

Douglas College Archives

Eaton's of Canada Limited Archives

Fondation Lionel-Groulx

Fort Steele Resource Information Centre

Frères du Sacré-Coeur

George Brown College Archives

Girl Guides of Canada Archives

Glenbow-Alberta Institute Archives

Grand Falls Historical Museum

Hamilton and District Council of Women Archives

Hamilton Public Library. Special Collections

Hiram Walker Historical Society

Hudson's Bay Company Archives. Archives of Manitoba

Irving House Historic Centre and New Westminster Museum

Jesuit Fathers of Upper Canada Archives

Jewish Public Library

Kamloops Museum

Kelowna Centennial Museum and National Exhibition Centre

King's County Historical Society and Museum

Lakehead University Library

Lambton County Library

London Life Insurance Company Archives

Louisbourg Archives

Lutheran Church in America. Archives of the Central Canada Synod

Lutheran Church. Missouri Synod. Archives of the Manitoba-Saskatchewan District

Maritime History Group

McGill University Archives

McGill University Libraries. McLennan Library. Department of Rare Books and Special Collections

McMaster University. Archives and Research Collections

Memorial University Center for Newfoundland Studies

Memorial University of Newfoundland. Folklore and Language Archives

93

Mennonite Heritage Centre Archives

Metropolitan Toronto Library

Mohawk College Department of Corporate Records and Archives

Moose Jaw Public Library. Archives Department

Mount Saint Vincent University Archives

New Brunswick Museum

Newfoundland Provincial Reference Library

Niagara Historical Resource Centre

North Shore Museum and Archives

North York Board of Education. F. W. Minkler Library

North York Public Library. Canadiana Collection

Oblates of Mary Immaculate. St. Paul's Province Archives

Pères Capucins. Montréal. Archives O.F.M. Capucins

Pères Clercs de Saint-Viateur. Montréal

Pères Oblats de Marie-Immaculée. Montréal

Perth County Archives

Presbyterian Church in Canada Archives

Provincial Archives of Alberta

Provincial Archives of British Columbia

Provincial Archives of Newfoundland

Public Archives of Canada

Public Archives of Nova Scotia

Public Archives of Prince Edward Island

Queen's University Archives

Religieuses Hospitalières de Saint-Joseph. Montréal

Rossland Historical Museum Association

Royal Bank of Canada

Royal Canadian Yacht Club

Royal Ontario Museum Library and Archives

Ryerson Polytechnical Institute Archives

St. Mary's University Archives

St. Michael's Hospital Archives

Saskatchewan Archives Board. Regina Office

Saskatchewan Archives Board. Saskatoon Office

Saskatoon Public Library

Sault Ste. Marie and 49th Field Regiment. R.C.A. Historical Society

Scarborough Historical Society

Séminaire de Sherbrooke

Séminaire de Trois-Rivières

Sisters of St. Ann Archives

Sisters of St. Joseph Archives

Sisters Servants of Mary Immaculate Community Archives

Société d'histoire régionale des Trois-Rivières

Société historique de la Côte-du-Sud. La Pocatière

Soeurs des Saints Nom de Jésus et de Marie. Longueuil

Soeurs Grises de Montréal. Nicolet. Archives de l'Hôtel-Dieu de Nicolet

Soeurs Grises de Montréal. Province de Ville-Marie. Montréal

Soeurs Ursulines. Trois-Rivières

Steel Company of Canada

Stratford Festival Archives

Stratford-Perth Archives

Sudbury Public Library

Tartu Institute Archives and Library

Thunder Bay Historical Museum Society

Toronto-Dominion Bank Archives

Trail City Archives

Ukranian Canadian Archives and Museum

United Church of Canada. Manitoba Conference Archives

United Church of Canada. Newfoundland Conference Archives

United Church of Canada. Central Archives

Université de Montréal. Programme de recherche en demographie historique

Université d'Ottawa. Centre de recherche en civilisation canadienne-française

Université du Québec à Chicoutimi

Université du Québec à Rimouski

Université du Québec a Trois-Rivières

Université du Québec a Trois-Rivières (CEDEQ)

Université Laval

University of Alberta. Cameron Library. Special Collections Unit

University of Alberta Archives

University of British Columbia. Woodward Biomedical Library

University of British Columbia. Special Collections Division

University of Calgary Library. Canadian Architectural Archives

University of Calgary Library. Special Collections

University of King's College Library

University of Manitoba. Department of Archives and Special Collections. Elizabeth Dafoe Library

University of New Brunswick. Harriet Irving Library. Archives and Special Collections Department

University of Saskatchewan Archives

University of St. Michael's College Archives

University of St. Michael's College Library

University of Toronto Library. Thomas Fisher Rare Book Library. Department of Rare Books and Special Collections

University of Waterloo. Rare Books and Archives

University of Waterloo. University Archives

University of Western Ontario. Faculty of Music

University of Western Ontario. Regional Collection

Vancouver City Archives

Vernon Museum. Archives and Art Gallery

Victoria City Archives

Victoria University Archives

Ville de Lachine

97

Ville de Québec

Ville de Saint-Laurent. Gestion des documents

Ville de Trois-Rivières

Whitby Historical Society Archives

Wycliffe College Archives

York University Archives

Yukon Archives and Records Services

38

Appendix B

Questionnaire

The Working Group on Archival Descriptive Standards of the Bureau of Canadian Archivists

FINDING AIDS IN CANADIAN ARCHIVES REPOSITORIES – A QUESTIONNAIRE

Instructions

Re: Question 3: type of finding aid

Please fill out a separate questionnaire for each type of finding aid (inventory, catalogue, index, register, etc.) you produce in your repository for each form of record (public or corporate record, manuscripts, maps, photographs, film, tape, machine readable record, etc.). Please include finding aids which are used internally for administrative purposes, such as accessions registers and shelf lists, as well as those available to users.

Re: Question 5: purpose of finding aid

Please describe the purpose the finding aid serves in terms of the information (in general terms) it provides for users or staff and in terms of how it facilitates locating information, or both. What is wanted is a short explanation of why you create this type of finding aid.

Re: Question 7: levels of arrangement

Some finding aids, such as inventories, contain descriptions at more than one level. In such cases, check off all appropiate levels. Some forms of record are not arranged at all these levels. Simply ignore the irrelevant terms and make the necessary translation to what might be unfamiliar terminology as applied to these forms of record.

Re: Question 8: relationship with other finding aids

Does this type of finding aid refer users to other finding aids, or it is generally used after another finding aid is consulted? If so, what is the relationship? For instance, most manuscript catalogues act as indexes to inventories and therefore refer users to the inventories for more detailed information.

Re: Question 9: descriptive elements

In this question, you are asked to break down the information in the finding aid into its component parts. We have chosen terminology we feel is most likely to be understood by Canadian archivists as a result of the usage of the Union List of Manuscripts and so on. For certain forms of record, there will definitely be specialized information, such as scale for maps or playing time for motion pictures, recorded in the finding aid. Please use the space provided to add elements, or, if necessary, attach a separate list of your own devising.

Re: Question 13: sample copies

Please ensure that you attach a copy of a sample of the finding aid in question. For lengthy inventories or lists, please copy only enough for the purposes of illustration. For indexes, catalogue and card files in general, please copy enough cards to illustrate the components of the finding aid.

QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Name of repository:

2. Department/Division/Section:

3. Type of finding aid:

4. Type of record or material described (e.g. manuscripts, maps, etc.):

5. Purpose of finding aid:

6. Is this type of finding aid available for:
researchers
staff use only

7. In terms of archival levels of arrangement, what level or levels are described by this type of finding aid?
repository
record group/collection
series
unit (specify box, file, reel, etc.)
other (explain)

8. What relationship does this finding aid have with other finding aids in your repository?

9. Descriptive elements: Please check only those elements regularly recorded in the descriptions in this type of finding aid. If you use a published standard to guide your work, give its name in the space provided below and do not fill out this question.
Name of published standard:
call number
title
name of creator/collector/author
principal occupation (creator)
birth and death dates (creator)

place of residence (creator)
biographical/historical sketch (creator)
form of material (mss., map, etc.)
quantity (physical extent)
whether originals or copies
location of originals
inclusive dates of material
description (scope and content note)
arrangement
language of document(s)
index terms (name/subject references)
provenance (source)
restrictions
reference to other finding aids
physical condition of documents
date of preparation of finding aid
Please list other elements in the space provided

10. Describe all control documents (standards, rules, authority files, processing guidelines) used in the production of this type of finding aid. Please append a copy of unpublished control documents to this questionnaire.

11. Format of finding aid:
paper inventory/list
card file
microform
machine-readable
other (specify)

12. Is this type of finding aid published and distributed or otherwise disseminated outside your repository?
yes
no

13. Please append a copy of a recently created sample of this type of finding aid to this questionnaire.
sample appended

14. Person filling out this questionnaire:
Name:
Phone number:

Appendix C

Data Fields

1. ARCHIVES CODE

A unique alphanumeric code that identifies each record (questionnaire response). For example, the fifth response from the first archives in Alberta (according to the mailing list used) would be coded AL1-5 (AL=Alberta, 1= the first archives, 5= the fifth questionnaire). Thus each record in the data base received an unique code, to make retrieval of information based on the individual record easier.

2. ARCHIVES NAME

The full name of the repository, and the division, if applicable.

3. ARCHIVES TYPE

The type of archives involved, with names taken from a specific list of terms, as follows:

Public (including government)

University (including college)

Church

Business (all private corporations)

Museum

Library

4. FINDING AID NAME

The name as given by the archives filling out the questionnaire.

5. FINDING AID TYPE

The type of finding aid described, with the name taken from a fixed list of terms, as follows:

Repository Guide: at the repository level, describing the holdings of the repository, with the *fonds* as the level of entry.

Thematic Guide: at the repository level, describing holdings by subject or theme, with entries usually at the level of *fonds*.

Catalogue: providing summary description and access points.

Accession Register: an administrative record of accessions received.

Inventory: a descriptive finding aid as per the Society of American Archivists' definition: "a basic archival finding aid that generally includes a brief history of the organization and functions of the agency whose records are being described; a descriptive list of each record series giving as a minimum such data as title, inclusive dates, quantity, arrangement, relationships to other series, and description of significant subject content; and, if appropriate, appendices which provide such supplementary information as a glossary of abbreviations and special terms, lists of folder headings on special subjects, or selective indexes."

Item List: providing description and location to the item level (can sometimes be a calendar).

File List: providing title or other description and location to the file level.

Box List: providing description and location to the box level.

Descriptive List: providing description on a subject, geographical, or other basis, rather than on the basis of arrangement.

Index (combined): providing access points based on various categories, such as name, subject, geography, and chronology.

Name Index: providing access points based on name headings.

Subject Index: providing access points based on subject headings.

Geographical Index: providing access points based on geographical headings.

Chronological Index: providing access points based on chronology.

Calendar: as per the SAA definition:"a detailed chronological list of individual documents, usually giving writer, recipient, date, place, summary of contents, type of manuscript, and page or leaf count."

Other: including transcripts, unit (i.e. tape or film) summaries, and other finding aids.

6. RECORD TYPE

The type of record described, based on a fixed list of terms, as follows:

government/corporate records

manuscripts

photographs

maps

publications

artifacts

architectural archives

moving images

sound archives

machine-readable records

prints, paintings and drawings

7. FINDING AID PURPOSE

A coded field is used to describe the *central* purpose of the finding aid, (i.e., which of the three following terms *most* suits the finding aid described); room is left to enter the notes and comments as given by the repository in question. The three purposes distinguished are:

Administration

Description

Location

8. RESEARCH USE

This is a yes or no field, to indicate whether researchers (yes) or staff (no) use the finding aid regularly.

9. ARRANGEMENT: SCOPE OF DESCRIPTION

This field indicates the of the descriptive finding aid, or scope the level of arrangement that the finding aid encompasses. For example, the scope of a guide to the holdings of an archives is the

repository level, the scope of an inventory is the *fonds* level. The terms used are:

repository

record group/collection *(fonds)*

series

unit

item

10. ARRANGEMENT: LEVEL OF DESCRIPTION

This field indicates the level at which material is described in the body of the finding aid. For example, the scope of the description of a repository guide will be at the repository level, but the entries are at the level of *fonds* and may contain descriptions of series. Hence, more than one level might be recorded in this field.

11. RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER FINDING AIDS

This is a yes or no field with added space for explanatory notes as found on the questionnaire. The choice of yes or no is based on a judgement of whether or not a significant functional relationship exists with another type of finding aid, for example as between a manuscript catalogue and inventories.

12. DESCRIPTION

This field includes the twenty-one separate subfields corresponding to the data elements indicated on the questionnaire; space for additional elements was provided. For each response, the total

number of subfields assigned was computed. The list of elements is as follows:

call number

title

name of creator/collector/author

principal occupation

birth and death dates

place of residence

biographical/historical sketch

form of material

quantity

originals or copies

location of originals

inclusive dates of material

description (scope and content note)

arrangement

language of documents

index terms

provenance

restrictions

reference to other finding aids

physical condition of documents

date of preparation of finding aid

additional elements

NUMERICAL ENTRY (total number of descriptive elements)

13. CONTROL DOCUMENTS

This is a yes or no field with added space for explanatory notes as found on the questionnaire. Information to be determined and added includes whether the control document is published or unpublished.

14. FINDING AID FORMAT

This field indicates the physical format of the finding aid, using one of the following terms:

paper

card

microform

machine-readable

paper/bound

other

110

15. DISSEMINATION

This is a yes or no field indicating whether or not the finding aid is available outside the repository.

16. ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION

This field includes such information as whether or not samples have been appended and whether or not the record input in the computer needs editing.

SELECT

ARCHIVAL DESCRIPTIVE STANDARDS

BIBLIOGRAPHY

compiled by Katherine Myers
for the Working Group on Archival Descriptive Standards

112

CONTENTS

1.0 Bibliographies 001-011

2.0 Terminology 012-018

3.0 Traditional Archives and Manuscripts 019-091

3.1 Manuals 092-116
3.2 Automated Systems 117-167

4.0 Media Archives 168-189

4.1 Cartographic Archives 190-202
4.2 Machine-Readable Archives 203-209
4.3 Documentary Art Archives 210-223
4.4 Film Archives 224-232
4.5 Sound Archives 233-238

5.0 General Development of Standards 239-263

6.0 Filing 264-267

1.0 Bibliographies 001-011

001 Aveney, H.W. "Cataloguing motion picture film: A descriptive bibliography." *The American Archivist* 39, no. 2 (April 1976): 167-75.

002 Canada. Archives publiques. *Bibliographie d'ouvrages et d'articles traitant d'archivistique conservés à la Bibliothèque des Archives publiques du Canada*. Ottawa: Archives publiques du Canada, 1978, 102 p.

003 Caron-Houle, F. *Guide to the reports of the Public Archives of Canada 1872-1972*. Ottawa: Information Canada, 1975, 97 p.

004 Duchein, M., comp. "Bibliographie internationale fondamentale d'archivistique/Basic international bibliography of archives administration." *Archivum*. Paris: Conseil international des archives/International Council on Archives, 1978, 250 p.

005 Dupuis, S.L., and L. Perron-Croteau, comps. *List of archival literature in the Public Archives Library*. Ottawa: Public Archives Library, 1980.

006 Evans, F.B., comp. *Modern archives and manuscripts: A select bibliography*. Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 1975, xiii, 209 p.

007 Evans, F.B., comp. *The history of archives administration: A select bibliography*. Paris: UNESCO, 1979, 255 p.

008 Evans, F.B., comp. *Writings on archives published by and with the assistance of UNESCO: A.RAMP study*. Paris: GIP and UNISIST, UNESCO, 1983, 33 p.

009 Herrgesell, B. *A MARC bibliography*. Washington, D.C.: Educational Resources Information Center, 1970, 18 p.

010 Kesner, R.M., comp. *Information management, machine-readable records, and administration: An annotated bibliography*. Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 1983, 153 p.

011 Morrow, M.D. *Bibliographic control of archives and manuscripts: A review of the literature*. Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 1973, 60 p.

2.0 Terminology 012-018

012 ACRL RBMS Standards Committee. "Relator terms for rare book, manuscript and special collections cataloguing." *College & Research Libraries News* 41, no. 8 (September 1980): 239-49.

A short list of terms, defined or explained briefly.

013 Canada. Archives publiques/Public Archives. *Traduction et définition des termes employées dans la gestion des documents*. Ottawa: Information Canada, 1972, 16 p.

A short work intended for both a records management and archives audience, listing frequently used terms of a fairly general nature, giving French-English equivalents and French definitions for the terms.

014 Ely, D.P. "The current status of audiovisual definitions and terminology: an international perspective." *International Cataloguing* 5, no. 2 (April/June 1976): 6.

A summary of a report given at the International Sym-

posium on Cataloguing, Coding and Statistics of Audio-Visual Material, Strasbourg, 7-9 January 1976. The summary states that although there is no approved list of audiovisual terms, the need for one remains a pressing issue; it goes on to outline briefly the current scope of audiovisual terminology and the criteria for terms and definitions.

015 Evans, F.B., comp., and W.L. Rofes, ed. "A basic glossary for archivists, manuscript curators, and records managers." *The American Archivist* 37, no. 3, (July 1974): 415-33.

Compiled by the Committee on Terminology with the Society of American Archivists. It gives a group of preferred terms and meanings in an attempt to standardize them.

016 Muret, P. "Inventorisation" ou "inventoriage"? *Archives et Bibliothèques de Belgique* 46, nos. 1-2 (1975): 313-23.

This article examines French and Dutch roots for the terms "inventorisation" and "inventoriage," attempting to give precise definition to "the action" and "the thing."

017 Owen, A.E.B., and D.M. Owens. "What is an archive? Or more thought on terminology." *Archives* 10, no. 46 (October 1971): 37.

The authors suggest the profession could be better served if commonly used terms were clarified, particularly "collection" (an artificial grouping) and "archive" (a naturally evolved grouping).

018 Society of American Archivists, National Information

System Task Force. *Data elements used in archives, manuscript and records repository information systems: A dictionary of standard terminology*. Chicago: NISTF, Society of American Archivists, October 1982, 20 p.

A final report providing the consensus on terminology reached by the NISTF Working Group on Data Elements and intended for use by archivists, records managers and manuscript curators as a common nomenclature for defining information systems. It is not a communications format in itself but was used for defining the elements in *A proposed MARC format for archives and* manuscripts produced by the Library of Congress and the Society of American Archivists (1982).(see 259.)

3.0 Traditional Archives and Manuscripts 019-091

019 Adams, J. "Finding aids at national archives." *Archifacts* (December 1983): 7-12.

The article examines "series lists," "descriptive lists," card catalogues, contemporary indexes, and registers, describing the "series list" as the primary means of accessing an archives group while "sub-series" appear in "descriptive list" and special subject areas can be accessed through card catalogues (biographical, immigrant, copyright, map, land claims and so forth). Examples are given.

020 Anglo-American Historical Committee. "Report on editing historical documents." *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* 1, no. 1 (June 1923): 6-25.

This is a statement of principles and includes practical guidelines for preparing the text of an historical docu-

ment, prepared by a committee of the Conference of Anglo-American Historians which included among its members R.L. Poole, A.G. Little and H. Jenkinson. Given are: rules for the use of abbreviations, punctuation, preparation of various forms of calendars and indexes, as well as terms to be used to describe documents.

021 Anglo-American Historical Committee. "Report on editing modern historical documents." *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* 3, no. 7 (June 1925): 13-26.

A follow-up to the June 1923 report, looking this time at modern historical documents, including: the construction of lists, descriptive catalogues and calendars; editor's introduction, notes and general suggestions; spelling and punctuation; dates; and indexing.

022 Arad, A., and L. Bell. "Archival description — a general system." *ADPA* 2, no. 3 (1978): 2-9.

While looking at archival description as a "manipulation of elements," the authors conclude that however much the terminology may differ, the concepts and procedures employed are similar although frequently confused by minor variations. They set about the task of standardization by defining general concepts, looking at levels of description, listing the elements of description, considering rules for practical description and recommendations for the treatment of subject headings.

023 Association des archivistes français. "L'évolution des instruments de recherche." *La Gazette des Archives* 79 (1972): 255-60.

A synthesis of the debates at the 1972 regional reunion of l'Association des archivistes français; it examines "le

répertoire numérique détaillé" and its various components, "les guides d'archives," and the means of publishing, selling and distributing finding aids.

024 Baudot, M. "En quoi innover?" *La Gazette des Archives* 52 (1966): 37-39.

A short discussion of the controversy surrounding the use of the "inventaire analytique," the "répertoire détaillé" and the "répertoire numérique" at the national and provincial levels in France, looking essentially at convenience versus legislated tradition.

025 Beaudin, F. "La création des instruments de recherche par l'archiviste." *Archives* 1, no. 1 (1969): 39-66.

An attempt to delineate the various types of finding aids and their use in archives, moving from the general to the specific. Five aids are identified: "le guide," "l'inventaire provisoire," "le répertoire numérique," "l'inventaire sommaire," and "l'inventaire analytique."

026 Bernard, G., et B. Mahieu. "L'accès du public aux documents d'archives." *La Gazette des Archives* 9 (1975): 215-37.

The authors examine the type and variations in service available at large and small French repositories. Of particular interest is the discussion of finding aids including a review of finding aids produced with the assistance of automated systems (CORAIL, ORIGAN and PRIAM).

027 Berner, R.C. "The arrangement and description of manuscripts." *The American Archivist* 23, no. 4 (October 1960): 395-406.

A detailed outline of the descriptive system Berner

ascribes to, complete with step-by-step instructions for each type of entry. The system is not intended for individual manuscripts but should be applied in archival fashion to the collection as a whole, moving from general collection description to subgroup and series entries.

028 Berner, R.C. "Manuscript collections and archives—A unitary approach." *Library Resources & Technical Services* 9, no. 2 (Spring 1965): 213-20.

In this article the author suggests that, because archives and manuscripts share many of the same characteristics, a "unitary approach" towards their description is warranted and discourages the tendency to have separate techniques to arrange and describe them.

029 Berner, R.C. "Manuscript catalogs and other finding aids: What are their relationships?" *The American Archivist* 34, no. 4 (October 1971): 367-72.

Berner examines the relationship between card catalogues and other finding aids, concluding that generally they are independent of one another rather than being two aspects of an integrated system.

030 Berner, R.C. "Arrangement and description of manuscripts." *Drexel Library Quarterly* 11, no. 1 (January 1975): 34-54.

Continuing along the same theme begun in his 1960 article, Richard Berner sees the arrangement of a manuscript reflected in the archival/manuscript description. Generally, finding aids are of two basic forms: the card and the page. The first gives access to the entire collection and should be used as an index to the page format descriptions (inventories, lists, registers) and as a partial

index to the accessions. It is the inventories and so forth which should be catalogued on cards, not the manuscripts themselves, requiring as a consequence very little detail. The detail is provided by the descriptions at the record group, subgroup, series, file folder and item levels in the page formats. Elements which comprise the overall description and examples of descriptions are also given.

031 Berner, R.C. "Arrangement and description: Some historical observations." *The American Archivist* 41, no. 2 (April 1978): 169-81.

An attempt to put the trends in archival thinking regarding arrangement and description into some perpective, starting with a look at early developments in the U.S. when archival description/arrangement grew apart from library traditions, traditions which in some cases still tend to shape thinking about archival description. The author sees the descriptive techniques used by Kenneth Duckett (see 094), R.S. Gordon (see 054), D.V. Martin (see 068), and P.S. Dunkin among those derived from librarianship, that is, taking contents notes and so on for catalogue entries independent of the record/manuscript arrangement, ignoring the arrangement-description bond. Berner is strongly influenced by the ideas of T.R. Schellenberg.

032 Berner, R.C. "Toward national archival priorities: A suggested basis for discussion." *The American Archivist* 45, no. 2 (Spring 1982): 164-74.

Berner looks at the traditions in description which have brought archivists to their present dilemma over automated access, the first being the historical manuscripts tradition, and the second being the public archives tra-

dition—HMT and PAT. He points out the need to identify the source of cataloguing information: the archives/manuscripts themselves or control devices like inventories and guides.

033 Berner, R.C., and M.G. Bettis. "Description of manuscript collections: A single network system." *College and Research Libraries* 30, no. 5 (September 1969): 405-716.

The system outlined here is a comprehensive one, based on describing the collection as a whole rather than item-by-item descriptions of a narrative nature. The authors suggest that names, whether personal, corporate or geographical, are the essential keys to subject association in an archive or manuscript search, therefore little subject description is done in favour of thorough indexing by name.

034 Berner, R.C., and U. Haller. "Principles of archival inventory construction." *The American Archivist* 47, no. 2 (Spring 1984): 143-55.

The authors have set down basic principles for the construction of inventories, keeping in mind links between arrangement and description which should be demonstrated in the inventories. Berner and Haller also conduct a literature review to indicate where various authors stand in terms of producing "coherent descriptive" programs, programs of a nature recommended by the Society of American Archivists Finding Aids Committee in 1978.

035 Biljan, M.F. "Les instruments de recherche des archives au service de la science." *Archivum* 24 (1974): 153-68.

A report given to the seventh International Congress on Archives (Moscow, 21-25 August 1972) which examines,

through responses to an international questionnaire, the philosophy behind description, and the role and the types of finding aids produced in archives throughout the world. It concludes that there are still significant gaps in the working use of terms and standards employed by various countries, particularly between those groups who use subject-oriented finding aids and those who advocate the use of functionally oriented finding aids.

036 Borsa, I. "The expanding archival clientele in the post-World War II period." *Archivum* 26 (1979): 119-26.

A report to the Eighth International Congress on Archives (Washington, 27 September—1 October 1976) which looks at the increased number of clients using archival institutions and the expanded fields of academic interest which have an effect on archival institutions. It suggests that the dramatic increase in the number of inexperienced archive searchers has put pressure on archivists to update and improve finding aids, and that research efficiency can be improved by combining a number of conventional finding aid systems into a "single, central finding-aid system."

037 Brand, K.E. "The place of the register in the manuscripts division of the Library of Congress." *The American Archivist* 18, no. 1 (January 1955): 59-67.

The article describes a system in which two types of register are used for received accessions: a full-length register, and a short-register. Both contain the following essential information: main entry and title, accession number, date received, source, status, initials of processor, title, quantity, restrictions, literary rights, "descriptions" (significant dates, physical status, history or provenance of records and significant subjects), and ref-

erence to published descriptions such as biographies, indexes or guides.

038 Brichford, M.J. *Scientific and technological documentation: Archival evaluation and processing of university records relating to science and technology*. Urbana-Champaign: University of Illinois, 1969, 35 p.

A general guide for the practical handling of scientific and technological archives, including the creation of finding aids.

039 Burke, F.G. "Archival cooperation." *The American Archivist* 46, no. 3 (Summer 1983): 293-305.

Burke examines a "tradition of uniqueness" which has prevented co-operation between archive repositories and points to the need to standardize description because it is impossible to computerize a "non-system." He suggests that traditional series descriptions are essays based on fucntional statements rather than actual contents records, often with nothing indexable in them.

040 Caillet, P., R. Mathieu, J. Waquet, et R. Favreau. "Problèmes de structure et d'inventaire." *La Gazette des Archives* 60 (1968): 13-30.

J. Waquet looks at the "national" versus "non national" practices for arranging, disposing and describing archival records; R. Mathieu describes the difficulties encountered when dealing with a specific series ("la série F") at the Archives nationales; and R. Favreau suggests more attention should be given to foreign practices for dealing with modern records, particularly the use of disposal schedules.

041 Cardinal, L., V. Chabot, J. Ducharme, G. Janson, et G.

Lapointe. *Les instruments de recherche pour les archives*. La Pocatière, Québec: Documentor Inc., 1984, 123 p.

Outlined are levels of archival description and finding aids which correspond to these levels, including examples, definitions for terms, and an extensive bibliography. The level of discussion tends to be rather general, without specific rules or nomenclature.

042 Caya, M. "La diffusion par la publication des instruments de recherche en archivistique." *Archives* 14, no. 1 (juin 1982): 31-50.

The article defines archival description as it differs from other library-oriented descriptions, focusing on the importance of placing records/archives in their functional context which precludes a descriptive system based purely on single items or their external characteristics. The finding aids themselves are examined, ideally designed to take the searcher level-by-level from general description to specific, clearly reflecting the provenance of the records being described. The author comments on the need for Canadian archivists, their associations and major institutions, to all work seriously towards standardizing finding aids, at least on a general level.

043 Cross, J.W. "Inventorying and scheduling records." *Records Management Quarterly* 7, no. 2 (April 1973): 28-31, 35.

This work takes the view that the records inventory is an essential tool for records managers and archivists. It outlines how to inventory and describe records, and the preparation of a "records control schedule." It includes some basic definitions for record units (single sheet, document, file unit and series) and a list of essential items to be included in the description of a record series.

044 Densmore, C. "Multi-institutional finding aids: historical development and future prospects." *The Bookmark* 39, no. 2 (Winter 1981): 124-28.

Examined here are those finding aids which have had a significant impact on archival methodology. The attributes and failings of existing multi-institutional descriptive finding aids are considered, pointing out that the most basic problem for all multi-institutional finding aids is the development of commonly accepted standards.

045 Dewing, C.E. "Manuscript cataloguing—the Beinecke method examined." *The American Archivist* 31, no. 1 (January 1968): 35-43.

This article is essentially a critical review of *A Catalogue of the Fredrick W. & Carrie S. Beinecke Collection of Western Americana, Volume One: Manuscripts*, compiled by J.M. Goddard and C. Critzler (London, 1965), which brings out some of the important problems and pitfalls encountered when attempting to describe a manuscript collection.

046 Ducharme, J. "Les instruments de recherche." *Les archives au XXe siècle*, par C. Couture et J.-Y. Rousseau. Montréal: Université de Montréal, 1982, 243-56.

Included in a general work, this section on finding aids describes: "le catalogue des *fonds*," "l'état général des *fonds*," "le guide de dépôt," "le guide par *fonds*," "les répertoires—sommaire, numérique simple, numérique détaillé and index," "les inventaires—sommaire, analytique and index," "guide par sujet de recherche," and "index de second niveau."

047 Duchein, M. "Les guides d'archives." *Archives et bibliothèques de Belgique* 47, nos. 1-2 (1976): 117-32.

This differentiates between three types of guides used in the archives of Belgium and France and goes on to indicate that the guide is not a substitute for inventories or lists, but rather gives a general overview of the available record groups ("*fonds*") in a repository. The article breaks down a guide physically into at least four parts: a practical introduction; a repository history; a list of finding aids; and a description of the available record groups and series in alphabetical order.

048 Duchein, M. "Le "respect des *fonds*" en archivistique: Principes théoriques et problèmes pratiques." *La Gazette des Archives* 97 (1977): 71-96.

The historical definition of an archive group ("*fonds*") is examined here, concluding that it is no longer easy to maintain the strict tradition when dealing with the type and quantity of modern records. A "*fonds*" which has grown "organically" may not necessarily be arranged in any systematic or methodical manner, but these qualities are invaluable to researchers. If systematic inter-relationships between records are not present in the arrangement they should be visible in the finding aids.

049 Ducrot, A. "Le nouvel état des inventaires des archives départementales, communales et hospitalières." *La Gazette des Archives* 95 (1976): 241-45.

New procedures for registering inventories are outlined in this article, complete with the principles behind preparing these finding aids. It recommends that archivists should be practical; condense information to essential data only; and present finding aids, despite their varying natures and complexities, in a clear and standard manner which will facilitate comprehension among all researchers.

050 East, S. "Describable item cataloging." *The American Archivist* 16, no. 4 (October 1953): 291-304.

A manual system of record control designed to access "large accumulations of records of diverse origin organized by record groups, each generally comprising numerous separately created and separately organized file series," which combines archival record descriptive technique with standard library indexing techniques.

051 Engst, E.D. *Standard elements for the description of archives and manuscript collections*. A report to the Society of American Archivists Task Force on National Information Systems. New York: Cornell University Libraries, 1980, 31 p. & appendices.

The report looks towards a national system of archives and manuscripts, starting with reviews of earlier reports which addressed standardization, moving on to general issues, development of a uniform format for the description of archives, manuscripts and special format material, and a group of standard elements proposed for a national system of description. The two appendices include a list of finding aids from the thirty surveyed repositories and charts listing descriptive elements used by the same repositories.

052 Evans, L.H., and E. Weiner. "The analysis of county records." *The American Archivist* 1, no. 4 (October 1938): 186-200.

This article is based upon the authors' experience with the Historical Records Survey in the U.S., which attempts to show the way to a good archival description and the potential problems which can be encountered.

053 Fournier, P.-F. *Conseils pratiques pour le classement et*

l'inventaire des archives et l'édition des documents historiques écrits. Paris: Librairie Ancienne Honoré Champion, 1924, 91 p.

Intended as a guide for local historians, this work gives a traditional and detailed description of the finding aids used in la Haute Loire, including the means of analyzing documents/records to be described and a detailed outline of the internal elements of a description. It tends to work at the item level for description.

054 Gordon, R.S. "Suggestions for organization and description of archival holdings of local historical societies." *The American Archivist* 26, no. 1 (January 1963): 19-39.

A paper which discusses record groups as: the papers of individuals, the papers of corporate bodies, and the official files of the group/society which holds the archives. It goes on to set standards for dates, location, name of writer, the use of square brackets (for elements derived from a source other than the records themselves) and provides some guidelines for subject description (they are to be brief, avoid bias, and to "eschew subjective, interpretative, and superlative adjectives").

055 Green, K. "Some comments on "record types." *Archives and Manuscripts* 5, no. 5 (November 1973): 115-23.

The author examines one aspect of "titling of archival series—the terms used to denote the *type* of record," stating the importance of using good descriptive series, titles to reflect the information being described accurately, and a preference for terms which reflect administrative action rather than a physical description of the series. Terms used in various Australian finding aids have been compiled to demonstrate the problems and ambiguities which exist in archival description.

056 Groton, L.J. "Arrangement and cataloguing of modern historical papers in the British Museum." *Archives* 8, no. 37 (April 1967): 2-7.

While looking at the arrangement and description of British Museum archives and manuscripts, the writer found that description is mainly an expansion of lists prepared in the arrangement process entailing a short introduction with the dates and details of the individual/group whose papers were being described. Further, no attempt at full calendaring is made, but rather summary descriptions are made with an attempt to create fully detailed indexes. The stages for processing records include preliminary arrangement and numbering, which is noted on a list; detailed arrangement; the writing of a description; and indexing.

057 Hildesheimer, F. "Inventaires d'archives et recherche historique." *La Gazette des Archives* 117-18 (1982); 71-81.

Examined here are finding aids currently available to researchers in France, focusing on the Archives nationales. It is suggested that it may not be enough for archivists simply to describe the historical material they work with. They should also be offering relevant questions to researchers in an attempt to close the gap between the archivist as producer ("producteur") and the historian as user ("utilisateur") of archival finding aids.

058 Holmes, O.W. "Archival arrangement—Five different operations at five different levels." *The American Archivist* 27, no. 1 (January 1964): 21-41.

Holmes builds on the premise that archives are already arranged (physically) by their agency of origin, complete in some cases, with the original finding aids, therefore changing the arrangement would lose the sense im-

posed on the original groupings and waste valuable time. He distinguishes between types or levels of arrangement for which there should be an archival instrument: the depository level, the record group level, the series level, and the filing unit level.

059 Houriez, E. "Un nouveau type d'instrument de recherche: Le répertoire numérique détaillé." *La Gazette des Archives* 64 (1969): 9-16.

The detailed numerical list (répertoire numérique détaillé) is described here as a new and contemporary form of finding aid introduced by the Archives départementales françaises as a compromise between the summary inventory (l'inventaire sommaire) and the numerical list (répertoire numérique). Its main characteristics include ease of production, more detail than a numerical list, and improved access to the archive group with the addition of an introductory section and an index.

060 Houriez, E. "Les tableaux méthodiques de noms géographiques dans les instruments de recherche." *La Gazette des Archives* 65 (1969): 97-102.

In this article, Houriez suggests that many record groups and series deal with cities, regions and so on which are not necessarily mentioned in their titles, and the inclusion of a table of geographic names in finding aids would be a significant advantage to researchers.

061 International Council on Archives/Conseil international des archives. "L'information et l'orientation des utilisateurs des archives." *Actes de la vingtième conférence internationale de la table ronde des archives*. Oslo, 1981. Paris: Conseil international des archives, 111 p.

A report of the discussions which took place at the 1981

conference on archives in Oslo based upon a questionnaire circulated amongst the fifty-five participating countries, stressing the nature of research conducted in archives and looking briefly at the nature and availability of finding aids.

062 International Council on Archives/Conseil international des archives. Normes à respecter pour l'établissement et l'organisation des institutions d'archives. *Actes de la dix-huitième conférence internationale de la table ronde des archives*. Nairobi, 1978. Paris: Conseil international des archives, 1981, 95 p.

The reports and debates presented at the 1978 Nairobi archives conference based upon the responses to a questionnaire posed to 226 participating archival institutions. Among the broad topics discussed were standards for finding aids, since a significant variance in priorities and practices were brought to light in the answers to the questionnaire.

063 Janzen, M.E. "Pruning the groves of academy: Appraisal, arrangement and description of faculty papers." *Georgia Archives* 10, no. 2 (Fall 1981): 31-40.

The author stresses the importance of noting the form of the documents described and the functions carried out by the faculty member. Description should provide the link between related materials, even if they are physically arranged in different locations.

064 L'Huillier, H., *et al*. "La rédaction des bordereaux de versement." *La Gazette des Archives* 115 (1981): 203-15.

A set of guidelines established by archivists and documentalists of the Cité des archives contemporaines and the Archives nationales for preparing transfer lists of

records being moved from one repository to another, which breaks the description down into essential elements including punctuation and pagination; some abbreviations and the use of italics are discussed.

065 Lucas, L. "Efficient finding aids: Developing a system for control of archives and manuscripts." *The American Archivist* 41, no. 1 (Winter 1981): 21-26.

Ms. Lucas presents an archival descriptive technique which includes scope notes, box lists, annotations and series summaries as a concise statement of facts, with basic elements which have some relationship from one inventory to another. She feels many archives have not defined their priorities, capabilities and needs with respect to archival description sufficiently to be able to decide if automation will indeed increase access to their collections. She has little doubt that a poor manual system will not be corrected or improved by introducing automation.

066 Lytle, R.H., ed. "Management of archives and manuscript collections." *Drexel Library Quarterly* 11, no. 1 (January 1975): 123 p.

A collection of articles on archive and manuscript administration, including a select bibliography compiled by Frank B. Evans and an appendix of terminology contributed by the editor.

067 Lytle, R.H. "Intellectual access to archives: I. Provenance and content indexing methods of subject retrieval." *The American Archivist* 43, no. 1 (Winter 1980): 64-75; "II. Report of an experiment comparing provenance and content indexing methods of subject retrieval." *The American Archivist* 43, no. 2 (Spring 1980): 191-207.

The first of these two articles looks at two methods of gaining subject access to archives by analyzing the "archives system" as a means of distinguishing the Provenance Method and Content Indexing Method of subject access. Once he had made the distinction between the two methods of retrieval, Lytle conducted an experiment to compare the two using the BRISC (Baltimore Regional Institutional Studies Center) automated system, the results of which were reported in his second article. It concluded that the Provenance Method had a better retrieval performance, although it appears that searcher failure is the pervasive cause of retrieval failure especially using the CI Method.

068 Martin, D. "Use of cataloguing techniques in work with records and manuscripts." *The American Archivist* 18, no. 4 (October 1955): 317-36.

Martin places the catalogue, as used in the library sense, as a finding aid separate from checklists, inventories, registers and calendars, and suggests the creation of "history cards" in the catalogue for agencies.

069 Nyholm, A.W. "Modern manuscripts: A functional approach." *Library Resources & Technical Services* 14, no. 3 (Summer 1970): 325-40.

The system of description outlined here is a "functional" one; in other words, rather than imposing a structure on a particular collection, the one that has evolved or "works" should be used. There are five classes of treatment in this system: Class E is the minimum "label and list" treatment; Class D is for unarranged collections and involves the arrangement by "type of material (letters, diaries and so forth); Class C is a functional or useable arrangement which is main-

134

tained or chosen if the material is without an arrangement; Class B involves the production of "guides (or indexes)" for groups; and class A involves "guides (or indexes)" for items.

070 Papenfuse, E.C. "The retreat from standardization: A comment on the recent history of finding aids." *The American Archivist* 36, no. 4 (October 1973): 537-742.

Mr. Papenfuse notes that there did seem to be a standard format for the production of finding aids in the U.S. during the 1930's and 1940's when the Historical Records Survey acted as a central editorial office which reviewed submitted inventories and required them to meet their standard. Currently, there are many different formats and means of archival description, not all of which are adequate finding aids. The author suggests the Society of American Archivists could offer a publishing service for guides and inventories that few could resist, which would ensure standards, once established, would be met.

071 Parker, G. "Calendar or "list and analysis"?" *Archives* 14, no. 44 (October 1970): 202-3.

While reviewing R.B. Wernham's *List and Analysis of State Papers Foreign Series preserved in the Public Record Office*, Mr. Parker comments on the value of a "List and Analysis" as compared to the older calendar style of finding aid. He seems to feel that the list and analysis is an inadequate means of accurately presenting information for the public's use relative to the time and expense required to compile such a work. A simple item by item description with indexes would be of more value.

072 Pavone, M.C. "Le rapport entre l'archiviste et le chercheur. "L'inventaire d'après la matière." Les index pour

une normalisation des instruments de recherche." *Archivum* 24 (1974): 178-81.

A response to a report by M.F. Bijan at the VIIth International Congress on Archives (Moscow, 21-25 August 1972) which suggests that part of the difficulty in providing adequate finding aids is the difficulty in anticipating all potential research needs and interests any one archive group may satisfy. The index, in its many forms, can bring about a compromise between functional organization and practical organization of archival records.

073 Pemberton, J.E., ed. *The bibliographic control of official publications*. Toronto: Pergamon Press, 1982.

A series of articles on various types of bibliographic control available for government documents and other official publications. It includes: a summary of the CODOC document coding scheme; and a look at the systems employed at Trinity College Library, Dublin, the University of Colorado, La Trobe University, University of Virginia, the Library of Parliament in Canada, and the Institute of Development Studies in England.

074 Pugh, M.J. "The illusion of omniscience: Subject access and the reference archivist." *The American Archivist* 45, no. 1 (Winter 1982): 33-44.

Outlined here are the differences between library and archival finding aids, and the problem of subject access in archives which seems to be solved solely by the specialized knowledge acquired by the archivist. The author feels that current arrangement and descriptive practices fail to focus on the user and his needs. Too many descriptions fail to capture any substance, giving only the record order, which is "unidimensional access"

more effectively gained by scanning a series.

075 Radoff, M.L. "A guide to practical calendaring." *The American Archivist* 11, no. 2 (April 1948):123-40, and 11, no. 3 (July 1948): 203-22.

A step-by-step procedural guide for calendaring archival material. Although this type of finding aid is no longer common, issues which remain current are discussed such as abstract length, basic abbreviations, determining dates, punctuation, the syntax of the description, and preparation of indexes.

076 Reingold, N. "Manuscripts of science—Analysis and description." *The American Archivist* 24, no. 2 (April 1961): 163-74.

Reingold looks at the importance of names and dates as "fixed points" from which research investigation of archival material starts. He is critical of content descriptions which gloss over the substance of manuscripts without supplying any concrete information, particularly physical attributes, general content summaries, representative examples, significant correspondents noted, a notation of terms employed in the documents, and any unique features described.

077 Research Libraries Group. *Archives and manuscripts in the Research Libraries Information Network: An overview of development in progress*. Stanford, California: RLG, Inc., nos. 83-66, (July 1983) 6 p. and appendices.

A look at RLIN's recent progress in the shared online field, including enhancements for supporting acquisition, accessioning, arrangement and description, and management of archival/manuscript material. From the bibliographic records on the database it is possible to

produce catalogue cards, guides to collections, lists, indexes, and online access to the catalogue/database itself. The RLIN formats are an adaptation of the US/MARC formats.

078 Rhoads, J.B. "New archival techniques." *Archivum* 24 (1974): 77-134.

A report given at the VIIth International Congress on Archives (Moscow, 21-25 August, 1972), summarizing intellectual and technical changes which have affected archival practice. A section on finding aids is included, providing an international perspective which suggests the "inventory" and the "list" are the most frequently used finding aids.

079 Sahli, N. "Finding aids: A multi-media, systems perspective." *The American Archivist* 44, no. 1 (Winter 1981): 15-20.

A short look at finding aids, pointing out a general inadequacy and the need to standardize finding aids and to integrate descriptive approaches to archival media. Sahli identifies some key questions to be asked before the development of a standardized descriptive system can be accomplished, and concludes that regardless of the media concerned, certain common, minimum descriptive standards can and should be applied and that hierarchical descriptions should exist for all media.

080 Schellenberg, T.R. "A nationwide system of controlling manuscripts in the United States." *The American Archivist* 28, no. 3 (July 1965): 409-12.

While considering nationwide control of manuscripts, Schellenberg comments on the National Union Catalog

of Manuscripts and automation for controlling documentary source material on a national level.

081 Scott, P.J. "The record group concept: A case for abandonment." *The American Archivist* 29, no. 4 (October 1966): 493-504.

Scott analyzes the difficulties of arranging and describing record groups that have been transferred from one agency to another and sees as a solution the abandonment of the record group as the principle category of classification except on paper. Instead, the record series could be used as the basis for physical arrangement, a system currently used in the Commonwealth Archives Office, Canberra, Australia. The author distinguishes four archival elements in record control: The "record series," the "item," the "document," and "information," with "interelement links" to the creating agencies.

082 Scott, P.J. "Facing the reality of administrative change —Some further remarks on the record group concept." *Journal of the Society of Archivists* 5, no. 2 (October 1974): 94-100.

A review of the series system employed by the Australian Archives in response to a critical article by G. Fischer (*Journal of the Society of Archivists* [October 1973]: 640-45), and a brief look at how this system is reflected in finding aids for Australian archives.

083 Scott, P.J., C.D. Smith, and G. Finlay. "Archives and administrative change." *Archives and Manuscripts* 7, no. 3 (August 1978): 115-27 and 7, no.4 (April 1979): 151-65.

In part I, the authors look at methods of recording administrative changes, preferring the description of "agencies" by function (such as the immigration func-

tion). In part II the types of administrative changes affecting records are analyzed, for example, change of location, name, department, or a change in status or level, any or all of which may involve a transfer of functions and the need to change current approaches to archival description.

084 Stapleton, R. "Jenkinson and Schellenberg: A comparison." *Archivaria* 17 (Winter 1983-84): 75-85.

A discussion surrounding the similarities and differences between the archival principles and theories advocated by Hilary Jenkinson and T.R. Schellenberg, including a segment on their approaches to archival description. The author suggests their differences are only in the motivation behind compiling finding aids, while both would agree on the essential descriptive elements and the idea that the description should reflect arrangement.

085 Szedo, A. "Les méthodes modernes de classement d'archives: Documents postérieurs à 1800." *Archivum* 14 (1968): 57-67.

A report to the Fifth International Congress on Archives, Brussels (1-5 September 1964), based on the replies from nineteen countries, which concluded that from a range of schemes devised for archival arrangement, the most frequently used ones are based upon the provenance of the records. For those archive groups whose provenance has been obscured, modern practice appears to allow for rearranging the documents, but only in so far as it reflects the creating agency's structure.

086 Taillemite, E. "Les archives et le service du public." *La Gazette des Archives* 83 (1973): 243-52.

140

A synthesis of the Association des archivistes français 1973 regional meetings. Discussion dwelt upon the degree of reference service the archivist should be providing for repository users, centering upon Article 72 of a 1921 statute outlining the archivist's responsibility to help researchers, however not to the extent that he or she is doing the research for them. In discussing finding aids, it was agreed a greater number seems mandatory but some refinements may be necessary because many existing finding aids are too complex for most researchers.

087 Taillemite, E. "Les instruments de recherches dans les archives." *Archives* 73, no. 2 (1973): 11-22.

Taillemite discusses the levels of finding aid available which can be anywhere between brief and exhaustive description. He describes "les guides," "le répertoire numérique simple," "le répertoire numérique détaillé," "l'inventaire sommaire," and "l'inventaire analytique," looking at the differences between them and their roles as research instruments.

088 U.S. Library of Congress. Manuscript Division. *Draft of a compilation of rules for the description of manuscript and textual archival materials*. Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress, 1981, 26 p.

An unofficial revision of AACR2, chapter 4 (cataloguing manuscript collections), intended as an attempt to codify Library of Congress Manuscript Division practices which emphasize "group" or "collection" rather than discrete item cataloguing. The final draft was compiled by Steven Hensen as *Archives, Personal Papers, and Manuscripts* (see 100) and is a cataloguing manual intended for use in archive repositories, historical societies and manuscript libraries.

089 U.S. National Archives. *Staff information circulars. No. 15. The control of records at the records group level*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. National Archives, July 1950, 12 p.

This circular looks at the objectives of the National Archives Records Description Program, at the preparation of individual finding aids (guides, inventories, lists), and at the levels of archival description.

090 U.S. National Archives. *Staff information papers. No. 18. Principles of arrangement*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. National Archives, June 1951, 14 p.

This paper/circular describes the National Archives arrangement policy and practice, which maintains the "provenance" theory but also maintains that record groups should be arranged according to organizational or functional relationships.

091 U.S. National Archives. *Lectures on archives administration*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. National Archives, ca. 1959.

Chapters 18 through 22 of this series focus on some aspect of archival description. The eighteenth chapter serves as an introduction which relies heavily on the writing of T.R. Schellenberg; the nineteenth deals with European finding aids; the twentieth looks at American finding aids and their difference from the European (English, French and German); and the final two chapters deal with the description of private papers.

3.1 Manuals 092-116

092 Canada. Public Archives/Archives publiques. *Union list of manuscripts in Canadian repositories/Guide for the prepa-*

142

ration of returns/Catalogue collectif des manuscrits conservés dans les dépôts d'archives canadiens/Comment dresser votre relevé. Ottawa: PAC/APC, 1982, 16 p.

Establishes general rules for the use of names; looks at the units or groups of papers in an archive/manuscript collection; gives guidelines for naming government departments and other organizations (including courts of law); deals with anonymous papers, dates, addresses, and types of material; and gives some guidelines for archival/manuscript description with examples.

093 Couture, C. et J.-Y. Rousseau. *Les archives au XXè siècle*. Montréal: Université de Montréal, 1982, VI, 491 p.

This work concentrates on the means of dealing with type, quality and quantity of modern records while maintaining basic archival principles. It is intended for use by both records managers and archivists, and includes an extensive glossary of terms.

094 Duckett, K.W. *Modern manuscripts: A practical manual for their management, care and use*. Nashville, Tennessee: The American Association for State and Local History, XVI, 1975, 375 p.

Duckett gives definitions for the finding aid terms calendar, name index, register, inventory and card catalogue, favouring the inventory as the best tool for modern bibliographic control. He also suggests that the inventory should contain the following elements: a) heading or introduction (title, dates, physical description, and can include literary rights and provenance); b) biography or history; c) statement on content and scope; d) container list or series description if more appropriate; and e) folder listing by title (if needed). Mr. Duckett also favours the production of an authority

file, gives a list of abbreviations, looks at some automated indexing techniques, and notes that item indexing or at the file level is too expensive making series level descriptions preferable.

095 Falco, N. *Manual for the organization of manuscripts in the Long Island Division of the Queensborough Public Library*. Jamaica, New York: Queensborough Public Library, 1978, 140 p.

A general "how-to" work, concentrating on the production of descriptive finding aids (inventories, description sheets, calendars, registers, and catalogues) with working definitions for each, and a number of examples from the Public Library collection on Long Island.

096 France. Direction des archives. *Code des archives de France, tome III, règlement général des archives départementales*. Paris: S.E.V.P.E.N, 1964, 51 p.

This manual of the Ministère des Affaires culturelles for the archives of France includes classification regulations and rules governing "répertoires et inventaires."

097 France. Direction des archives. *Manuel d'archivistique: Théorie et practique des archives publiques de France*. Paris: S.E.V.P.E.N, 1970, 805 p.

Chapter 5 of this general work deals specifically with finding aids, starting with an historical overview, the theory behind the practice, and concludes with the actual production of "les instruments de recherche," including three types of guide (repository, record group and thematic), two types of inventory (analytic and summary), two types of list (numeric and detailed), indexes and tables. As a whole, the manual is an attempt to relate French archival practice to other theories

employed internationally, the finding aid format and practice being more rigidly standardized in France than most other countries.

098 Gracy II, D.B. *Archives & manuscripts: Arrangement and description*. Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 1977, V, 49 p.

Mr. Gracy identifies three components of a descriptive system; internal control, in-house reference and "out-of-house" reference (such as guides), identifies three types of inventory; preliminary, summary and final, and states that the media should not have any bearing on the descriptive technique itself. He also advocates the use of the Society of American Archivists's *Inventories and registers: A handbook of techniques and examples* format for an inventory.

099 Gracy II, D.B. *An introduction to archives and manuscripts*. Professional Development Series Volume 2. New York: Special Libraries Association, 1981, 36 p.

A program of description is set out in this book which includes inventories to describe collections and record groups, indices and lists for repository consultation, guides for the complete holdings of each repository, and national cumulations for repositories and individual holdings within repositories.

100 Hensen, S.L., comp. *Archives, personal papers, and manuscripts: A cataloging manual for archival repositories, historical societies, and manuscript libraries*. Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress, 1983, 51 p.

Compiled by Steven Hensen with the help of a committee of archivists from across the U.S., this work is intended to be used as a supplement to Chapter 4 of the

Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules (2d ed.). The scope is as general as possible to encompass the full range of manuscript materials looking at sources of information, descriptive elements (both physical and internal) as well as examples of description. It includes a section which looks at the level of detail in description (p. 9), working from the minimum or the first level to the third level which includes all the elements set out in the rules.

101 Hodson, J.H. *The administration of archives*. Toronto: Pergamon Press, 1972, 217 p.

Hodson attempts to assimilate both Schellenberg and Jenkinson in a concise look at the various types of finding aid used in the U.S. and Britain (inventories, descriptive lists, guides, calendars and indexes), including a breakdown of the elements to be included in an inventory.

102 Jenkinson, H. *A manual of archive administration*. London: Percy Lund, Humphries & Co, 1965, 261 p.

Jenkinson's manual is one of the classics of archive administration, setting down theory generally including the need for homogeneity in "phraseology" describing methods of listing and calendaring. He describes records along hierarchical divisions from the "group or *fonds*," to the "division," the "class" and the "individual document" in an inventory, list, detailed list, calendar, repository list (or summary inventory), transcription or index.

103 Menzenska, M.J. *Archives and other special collections: A library staff handbook*. New York: School of Library Service, Columbia University, 1974, 87 p.

This work is intended to be a guide available to all col-

lege libraries who hold archive/manuscript collections, based upon the practices of the Holy Family College Library, New York. The elements for finding aids meet the requirements of the National Union Cataloging of Manuscripts Commission (NUCMC). The guide includes examples, an appendix of abbreviations, a glossary and an extensive select bibliography.

104 Mitchell, T.W., ed. *Norton on archives: The writings of Margaret Cross Norton on archival & records management*. Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press, 288 p.

Chapter 6 of Mitchell's book deals with the classification and description of archives as it was practiced at the Illinois State Library. Provenance is stressed, possible forms for description given, the main characteristics of a series described, essential elements to be used in the history of a creating agency outlined, important index characteristics explored, and practical advice on how to write a concise description given.

105 Muller, S., J.A. Feith, and R. Fruin. *Manual for the arrangement and description of archives*. New York: H.W. Wilson; 1940, 225 p.

Recognized as one of the "touchstones" of archive administrative theory, the manual was translated from the Dutch in 1920 and continues to provide relevant definitions and theory for archival description.

106 Schellenberg, T.R. *The management of archives*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1965, 383 p.

A general work in which description of archival material is a part. It attempts to define exactly what "description" is, "identifying the record unit" and "enumerating its essential qualities or attributes" and its objectives to

make records accessible for use, to provide information on all records in a repository, to provide special information about records, and to make the finding aids themselves readily available. Schellenberg suggests that the degree of description (whether brief or detailed) should be determined by the degree of research interest, and that when applying theory to description the series should be the preferred basic unit of records to be described.

107 Schellenberg, T.R. *Modern archives: Principals and techniques*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965, 247 p.

In this work Schellenberg states that: "records are substantively described by referring to the administrative body that created them, the functions or activities that gave rise to their creation, and the subjects to which these functions or activities relate" (p. 194). He looks at finding aids produced in France, Germany, England and the U.S. through comparison, identifying the fundamental difference between European and American description the use of "volumes, bundles or containers" as units of description in Europe while in the U.S. the "series" is the usual descriptive unit.

108 Society of American Archivists. College and Universities Archives Committee. *Forms Manual*. Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 1973, 263 p.

The manual is essentially a collection of forms employed in American and Canadian educational institutions, 305 in all selected from a sampling of 1,000, which have been arranged in fifteen functional categories. Pages 77-90 are devoted to description and control forms, among them a data sheet for the National Union Catalog of Manuscript Collections (NUCMC).

109 Society of American Archivists. Committee on Finding Aids. *Inventories and registers: A handbook of techniques and examples*. Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 1976, 36 p.

Two systems of finding aid are examined, those used for archival description and those used for manuscript description. By breaking them into parts and comparing one to the other, the mechanics of producing an archival inventory or a manuscript register are given under the headings "preface," "introduction," "agency history or biographical sketch," "scope & content note," "series description," "container listing," "item listing," and "index."

110 Society of American Archivists. Subcommittee on Repository Guides. *Guidelines for the preparation of a repository guide*. Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 1977, 3 p. & appendices.

A short set of guidelines based on an examination of several existing college and university guides to archive/ manuscript collections. The objectives, costs, and format are outlined, with the format being described as the sum of an introduction, table of contents, entry descriptions and index. Examples are given in the appendices.

111 Society of American Archivists. Forms Manual Task force. *Archival forms manual*. Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 1982, 145 p.

A new edition of the 1973 Society of American Archivists manual edited by J. Frank Cook. The forms were selected from submissions from across the U.S. and include a group devoted to arrangement and description.

149

112 Taylor, H.A. *The arrangement and description of archival materials*. ICA Handbook Series vol. 2. New York: K.G. Saur, 1980, 181 p.

A manual on archives, emphasizing the need for archival descriptive standards: "to describe is to control and without accurate description there can be no effective use... to describe is also to inform" (p. 15). The finding aids examined move from the general to the particular, noting that the purpose for description is to control resources, to provide information on archival resources for the researcher, and to reflect archival arrangement. Basic elements to be included in a description are physical (type, composition, form, volume) and substantial (source, function, subject matter, covering dates). Finding aids include inventories, registers, card catalogues, item lists, calendars, shelf or location lists, box lists, conversion lists, reference files, finding aid index, restricted access files, repository guides, national guides and catalogues, and indexes.

113 U.S. Library of Congress. "Manual for manuscript items planned to supplement AACR 2." *Library of Congress Information Bulletin* 40, no. 24 (June 1981): 206-7.

Notification of the Library of Congress' intent to supplement the procedures used to catalogue manuscript material in AACR 2 which provides a summary of the justification, purpose and scope of the proposed supplement.

114 U.S. National Archives. *The preparation of preliminary inventories*. Washington, D.C.: National Archives, May 1950, 14 p. Staff information circular no. 14.

The purpose, scope, organization, content, style and format of a National Archive preliminary inventory is

outlined, complete with examples.

115 University of Washington Libraries. University Archives and Manuscripts Division. *Manual for accessioning, arrangement and description of manuscripts and archives*. Seattle: University of Washington, 1979, 54 p. & appendices.

University of Washington libraries employ an integrated card catalogue and page format finding aid system to establish access to the appropriate level of record control achieved by the physical arrangement. It consists of three cumulative indexes (name, subject and chronological) which lead to Data Sheets and Inventory/Guides which in their turn lead to the accession.

116 University of Washington. School of Medicine Library. *Archives Procedural Manual*. St. Louis, Missouri: University of Washington, 1974.

As the title suggests, this is a detailed manual for maintaining archival material at the School of Medicine Library. It relies on T.R. Schellenberg's theories, and finding aids described include a collection register, the NUCMC inventory, inventories, computer index, and a picture index.

3.2 Automated Systems 117-167

117 Abrams, L. *Developing systems standards for archives and manuscript control*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Society of American Archivists. Minneapolis.

A description of a project to adapt the RLIN (Research Libraries Information Network) descriptive format for archive and manuscript use. This is a practical ap-

151

proach to standardization, looking at the types of information to be placed in each field and conventions used to compile and structure the data.

118 Alexander, D. "A description of indexing procedures for the 'Agreement on Account of Crew.'" *Archives* 11, no. 50 (Autumn 1973): 86-93.

An account of the machine-aided indexing procedure followed by the Maritime History Group, Memorial University of Newfoundland, for a collection of "Crew Lists" and "Official Logs" acquired from the British Public Record Office, with lengthy consideration of coding errors and programming difficulties. The document index produced was designed as a matrix of years and ships, the ships having been identified by their official numbers.

119 American National Standards Institute. *American national standard for bibliographic information interchange on magnetic tape*. New York: American National Standards Institute, 1971. 34 p.

A format for the interchange of bibliographic records on tape, intended for "all forms of material capable of bibliographic description." It outlines the scope and purpose of the format, definitions, the actual fields being used, revisions, and a list of "variable-field data" elements.

120 Atherton, J. "Mechanization of the manuscript catalogue at Public Archives of Canada." *The American Archivist* 30, no. 2 (April 1967): 303-9.

This article outlines the need and type of rules for use

in a PAC project dictated often by the limitations of automation at the time the project was being conducted.

121 Avram, H.D. "IFLA Working group on content designators: Report from its chairman." *International Cataloguing* 4, no. 1 (January/March 1975): 3-6.

A report from the 1974 IFLA Conference in Washington DC, which examines the requirements of a universal MARC format. It states that a format for bibliographic data is composed of 3 elements: a) the structure of the record (the physical representation of the information on the machine-readable medium); b) the content designators (the means of identifying data elements); and c) the content of the record (the data itself). The scope of the Working Group's responsibility is discussed, followed by the function of content designators.

122 Avram, H.D. and L.J. Rather. "Principles of format design." *Journal of Library Automation* 7, no. 3 (September 1974): 161-67.

A summary of several IFLA papers prepared by the Working Group on Content Designators, essentially preparing for a SUPERMARC format. Term definitions, tags, indicator and data element identifiers are given, complete with their functions, which conform to ISO 2709 and ISO 646. Six basic principles are established: the format should be designed to handle all media; accept single-level and multi-level structures; tags should identify a field by type of entry as well as function; indicators should be tag dependent and consistent; data element identifiers should be tag dependent but common data elements should be identified by the same data element identifiers across fields; and fields are primarily related to broad categories of information.

123 Bain, A.L. "Computer applications to archives and manuscripts at the Smithsonian Institute Archives." *ADPA* 2, no. 3 (1978): 13-21.

Bain gives an historical perspective and then moves onto a discussion of SELGEM (Self-Generating Master), a computer-assisted indexing system which generates name and subject indexes to the Smithsonian finding aids. Fields, elements and examples are also given.

124 Bell, L. "Survey of archival data processing applications in Great Britain." *ADPA* 1, no. 3 (1975): 11-26.

A list and description of ADP applications used in Great Britain, the projects are named, the archive responsible given, the nature of the project described, and its status, publication, program language, input, forms, output device, and field information (length, type, identification, contents, description).

125 Bland, R.N., and J.B. Lloyd. "Online manuscript search service." *Information Technology and Libraries* 2, no. 3 (September 1983): 295-300.

A look at an information retrieval system for manuscripts and indexes which provide full search and maintenance. It discusses item versus group description of manuscripts, noting that available item-based descriptive systems lack the flexibility to handle large accumulations of material, resulting in the creation of OMSS. This database has three files which are inter-related: the "Collection Register File"; the "Name File"; and the "Subject File." These are searched through "lexically and syntactically" simple commands entered at the terminal. Overall the Online Manuscript Search Service OMSS was an attempt to pull together diverse archival finding aids through a computer system.

126 Boberach, H., and W. Buchmann. *Advanced technologies and the expansion of archives access*. Washington, D.C.: ICA, VIII International Congress on Archives, 27 September—1 October 1976, 22 p.

As part of this discussion, some time is given to finding aids, the production of alphabetical and chronological indexes by automated methods is since applicable to archives. Inventories kept on computer databases are also considered with reference to German experiments which have brought out many potential difficulties, the principal problems relating to time and expense. Accomplishments with finding aid automation experiments (primarily indexing projects) in some twenty-four countries are also outlined.

127 Brichford, M., H. Ostroff, J.P. Butler, and R.H. Lytle. "Intellectual control of historical records." *The American Archivist* 40, no. 3 (July 1977): 307-13.

Taken from a conference on "Setting Priorities for Historical Records," presentations from the various authors are given followed by a general discussion which focused on the quality, quantity and control requirements for archival material, and the problems and potential presented by the introduction of computer assisted finding aids. During the discussion the cost effectiveness of automation was challenged, the problems entailed in applying automated techniques to archival work before standards have been set, and the relationship between computer programmers and archivists discussed. Opinions diverged sharply on the practical value of published inventories.

128 Calmes, A. "Practical realities of computer-based finding aids: The NARS A-1 experience." *The American Archivist* 42, no. 2 (April 1979): 167-77.

A description of how the NARS A-1 system was designed, the hardware and software used, the process of entering data, the output, maintenance, personnel involved and costs. It does not include any detail on the format used.

129 Canada. Public Archives. Archives Branch. *Feasibility of indexing system integration: Project no. 1-4285*. Ottawa: Bureau of Management Consulting Supply and Services Canada, May 1984, 100 p. with separate appendices.

A study of public information requirements which constitutes a part of a project to define automation requirements. Included is an historical perspective of previous Archives Branch initiatives in this area, an analysis of current access, conclusions, recommendations, bibliography, examples and appendices.

130 Cloulas, I. "Les instruments de recherche documentaire réalisés par l'informatique aux Archives de France." *ADPA* 3, no. 2 (1980): 51-53.

A report on the use of ADP systems at the Archives nationales in France. MINOTAURE was used for the production of a chronological inventory and the Keyword in Context system employed to produce a personal names and professions index. LEONORE, ARCADE, SERA C and EGERIE are the other systems used or considered for use at the Archives nationales.

131 Coleman, G.P. "Automated access to archival sources: Older persons record project." *Documentation Newsletter* 6, no. 1 (Spring 1980): 7-9.

The procedures used for the production of a SPINDEX II index.

132 Cook, M. "Applying automated techniques to archives administration." *Journal of Documentation* 39, no. 2 (June 1983): 73-84.

Cook suggests the most serious problem for adapting bibliographic or documentation packages to archival description is the levels of description. He also mentions that the demise of the PROSPEC-SA experiment in Britain was owing in part to a lack of agreement on syntax and terminology for use in a union index, and on the structures for presenting data. Michael Cook also suggests that any final standard will have to include the methods of listing (inventorying).

133 Crawford, W. "Library standards for data structures and element identification: U.S. MARC in theory and practice." *Library Trends* 31, no. 2 (Fall 1982): 265-81.

This article is primarily concerned with "building, maintaining and using US/MARC and other such stan dards" (p. 265). It looks at questions surrounding the practical machine-use of the standards, some cost-benefits, data entry, content restrictions, storage, retrieval and manipulation of data.

134 Dolgih, F.I., and O.A. Mihajlov. "Computers in the state archives of the USSR." *UNESCO Journal of Information Science, Librarianship and Archives Administration* 5, no. 4 (October-December 1983): 235-42.

Outlined is the use being made of automated information-retrieval in the USSR, focusing on the systems at the Main Directorate of Archives and the USSR Technical Documentation Research Center. The basic function of the first system discussed is the compilation of various interarchive reference works (guidebooks, indexes, subject lists and so forth. The Technical Docu-

mentation Research Center and state archives are developing a system for a series of State Archival *Fonds* subject fields. Some of the elements used, examples of the work sheets, and a catalogue extract are also given.

135 Engst, E. "Automated access to archival sources: Archival reports and publications." *Documentation Newsletter* 6, no. 1 (Spring 1980): 10-12.

A report on the application of SPINDEX II as a control system for Cornell University reports and publications.

136 Engst, E. "Automated access to archival sources: County historical resources." *Documentation Newsletter* 6, no. 1 (Spring 1980): 12-15.

A description of county guides produced through the use of SPINDEX II and SPINDEX III programs. These are collection-level indexes for personal names, organization names, geographic locations, and general subjects.

137 Engst, E. "MARAC finding aids exhibit." *Mid-Atlantic Archivist* 9, no. 1 (Spring 1983): 1-4.

A report on a display of computer-generated finding aids used at sixteen U.S. archives.

138 Evans, M.J., R.L. Turnbauch, L. Lucas, and K.J. Baumann. *The Midwest State Archives guide project: An evaluation*. A report submitted to the National Historical Publications and Records Commission (NHPRC) upon the completion of grant no. 80-8. (September 1982), 62 p. & appendices.

This final report to NHPRC looks at the project history, accomplishments, purposes, problems, and suggests al-

ternate approaches for the creation of a descriptive database. It includes the project database design, a style sheet and data entry forms in the appendices. It is worth noting that the unofficial Library of Congress revision of AACR 2 produced under the guidance of Steven Hensen is used as the descriptive standard.

139 Frusciano, T.J. "Automation programs for archival and manuscript repositories." *Library Hi Tech* 1, no. 2 (Fall 1983): 72-77.

A look at national level (U.S.) projects for standarization—Society of American Archivists National Information Systems Task Force (NISTF), the RLG Task Force on Special Formats, the National Historical Publications and Records Commission (NHPRC)—and some of the systems being used, such as SPINDEX (a modified Key-Word-In-Context program), SELGEM, PARADIGM and ARCHON. The author notes that the lack of standardization in archival description has proven to have been a major obstacle in attempts to automate.

140 Gapen, D.K. "MARC format simplification." *Journal of Library Automation* 14, no. 4 (December 1981): 286-92.

An historical and current perspective on MARC standards and codes, looking at the relationships between different formats, the benefits derived from them, the costs involved, and the changes that have resulted.

141 Geary, J.W. "An evolutionary process: Select historical developments in the use of automated systems at archival repositories in the United States." *Illinois Libraries* 65, no. 4 (April 1983): 238-44.

A broad overview of automated systems used by archi-

val institutions, primarily for the production of finding aids.

142 Hajnal, P., V. de Bruin, and D. Biteen. "MARC and CODOC: A case study in dual format use in a university library." *Journal of Library Automation* 10, no. 4 (December 1977): 358-73.

The Department of Government Publications at the University of Toronto Library uses a dual format, computer-aided system for processing documents. It is a combination of MARC and CODOC which are described individually according to their tags and fields, and as they apply to the documents collection which is arranged alphabetically and hierarchically by corporate author.

143 Hickerson, H.T. *Archives & manuscripts: An introduction to automated access*. Chicago: The Society of American Archivists, 1981, 60 p.

A basic introduction to computers and their current potential and use in archives. Using an historical perspective, the author provides a brief look at MRMCII, SPINDEX II and III, SELGEM, GRIPHOS, CODOC, ARCHON, PARADIGM, NARS A-1, and a system developed for the survey of sources for the history of biochemistry and molecular biology, discussing their uses, versatility and means of description. It is also pointed out that the MARC manuscripts format "is another example of the incompatibility between library individual item cataloging and archival analyses and description" (p. 25).

144 Hickerson, H.T., J. Winters, and V. Beale. *SPINDEX II at Cornell University and a review of archival automation in the United States*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Libraries, 1976, 90 p.

A report on SPINDEX II (Selective Permutation Indexing), a computer-generated archival finding aid system, oriented to the printing of guides rather than information retrieval. Description is based on the standard format for analyses and description used at the Department of Manuscripts and University Archives at Cornell University.

145 Hopkinson, A. "International access to bibliographic data: MARC and MARC-related activities." *Journal of Documentation* 40, no. 1 (March 1984): 13-24.

Looks at the use of ISO 2709 record structure as an international format, at the *UNISIST Reference Manual* as an exchange format, the development of UNIMARC (under IFLA), and the format used by MINISIS developed by the International Development Center (IRDC, Ottawa). The article suggests that international exchange formats can only be really successful if internationally accepted authority files and cataloguing rules are included.

146 Hopson, M. "Automated access to archival sources: Personal papers." *Documentation Newsletter* 6, no. 1 (Spring 1980): 3-7.

Two SPINDEX II indexes are discussed, each using a different indexing technique but similar formats and general EDP application to index production to provide folder-level access to collections of a multi-media nature.

147 International Archival Round Table Conference. "Archives and automation." *Record of the thirteenth international conference of the archival round table, Bonn 1971*. Paris: International Council on Archives, 1972, Part I, p. 1-97.

Reported discussion from the 1971 Round Table Conference on Archives which resulted from a questionnaire (included) sent to the twenty-nine participating countries. Among the issues surrounding archival automation are actual experiences and major problems encountered.

148 Kesner, R.M. "Microcomputer archives & records management systems: Guidelines for future development." *The American Archivist* 45, no. 3 (Summer 1982): 299-311.

A work aimed primarily at the information field, looking at management operations, hardware, and non-archive specific software.

149 Kesner, R.M., comp. *Information management, machine-readable records, and administration: An annotated bibliography*. Chicago: The Society of American Archivists, 1983, 153 p.

A revision of *Automation, machine-readable records and archival administration: Annotated bibliography*, intended for an archival audience, but covers works beyond the archives and records management professions alone.

150 Kesner, R.M., and D. Hurst. "MARS: A development report." *ADPA* 3, no. 2 (1980): 11-20.

A report on the development of MARS (Microcomputer Archives and Record Management System) at the Archives of Appalachia. It is introduced with a description of SPINDEX and SELGEM, pointing to their shortcomings, in particular the high cost of production. MARS is structured as a "series of logically linked screens, hierarchically organized" for each stage of processing, from acquisition to description.

151 Long, A. "UK MARC and US/MARC: A brief history and comparison." *Journal of Documentation* 40, no. 1 (March 1984): 1-12.

The development of the divergent MARC formats is traced, along with some explanations for the variations, and the need for a truly international format.

152 Lytle, R.H. "A national information system for archives and manuscript collections." *The American Archivist* 43, no. 3 (Summer 1980): 423-26.

In this discussion of a national information system, the author notes that while discussing specific problems in the construction of such a system, a set of descriptive elements and a standard for recording them must be agreed upon, at least at the minimum level. He also suggests that archivists need to examine the users and their needs more closely to identify relevant subject areas in preparation for creating standards for subject access.

153 MARC Development Office. *Manuscripts: A MARC format*. Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress, 1973, 47 p.

A machine-readable cataloguing format based on ANSI Z39.2-1971 (American National Standard for Bibliographic Information Interchange on Magnetic Tape), which provides specifications and content designators. It is intended for map and music manuscript use as well as for traditional manuscripts, the required data elements having been included. Many of the fields are for local control of a collection, included to promote a standard local format as well as an exchange format. New elements and addenda are available in the Information Bulletin of the Library of Congress.

154 McCall, F. *PROSPEC manual*. London: Research and Planning Unit, Public Record Office, ca. 1978. Unpublished.

This is an in-house manual developed for the use of PRO employees to provide direction in the use of the PROSPEC system. The PROSPEC database contains the elements of information needed to produce "The Guide to the Contents of the Public Record Office," the "Summary of Records," and other associated catalogues and indexes. It is a computer-assisted system for archival description which works at the series (as opposed to the item level) for bibliographic control. Data elements and the forms used are included.

155 Mid-Atlantic Regional Archives Conference (MARAC). "Archives and manuscripts in RLIN." *Mid-Atlantic Archivist* 13, no. 2 (Spring 1984): 9.

Yale, Cornell, Stanford universities, the Hoover Institute at Stanford, and the Labour Management Relations Documentation Center at Cornell are entering archival/manuscript records onto the RLIN system, a project started in January of 1984. The records are entered using US/MARC, Archival and Manuscripts Control (AMC) format, which allows a "bibliographic" record to be entered onto the database and then later modified as the processing continues.

156 National Information Systems Task Force and Library of Congress. *USMARC archival and manuscripts control content designators*. NISTF, Society of American Archivists and Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.: January 1983.

An archival approach to the use of content designators, unlike the "form" or "medium" approach used in other

US/MARC formats. The designators are given in detail along with a note indicating whether or not they are revisions of those found in the *MARC Formats for Bibliographic Data (MDBD)*.

157 Newburger, A.M., and P.M. Rosenberg. "Automation and access: Finding aids for urban archives." *Drexel Library Quarterly* 13, no. 4 (October 1977): 45-59.

A critical look at archival access as it is provided by traditional finding aids, one which asks some very pertinent questions: for example, "How can the computer improve access to primary records? What in the records is information? What are the appropriate pointers to information?"

158 Palm, C.G. "Prospects for archival information exchange: NISTF conference report." *The American Archivist* 47, no. 2 (Spring 1984): 205-13.

A report from the March 1983 National Information Systems Task Force (NISTF) invitational conference, which outlines the proposed agenda for work to be done over the next three to four years. There are six functional categories which involve gathering information relevant to archival information exchange systems, system design research studies, implementing exchange systems for archives, establishing compatible relationships among systems, system evaluation, communication and education for both the profession and those outside of the profession who come in contact with these systems. A list of NISTF's accomplishments since its establishment in 1977 is also included.

159 Presser, C. "CODOC: A computer-based processing and retrieval system for government documents." *College & Research Libraries* 39, no. 2 (March 1978): 94-98.

A description of CODOC (Co-operative Documents), a computer access system developed by the Universities of Guelph and Waterloo for government document collections. It uses a hierarchically based coding scheme which reflects country of origin, level of government, agency, date of publication, series or title. The code creates a unique document number which is used for retrieval.

160 Research Libraries Group. *Using RLIN II for archival processing: A case history. 83-101*. Stanford, California: RLG, Inc., December 1983.

An account of an experiment with the Research Libraries Information Network (RLIN II) as a means of controlling and describing an archive group or manuscript collection. The bibliographic description is tried using Yale University's Department of Manuscript and Archives collection. Each step of the process is given, including the fields and elements.

161 Roberge, M. "SAPHIR: inventaire et gestion des archives du Québec." *Archives* 13, no. 3 (décembre 1981): 3-9; 14, no. 1 (juin 1982): 5-17; 14, no. 3 (décembre 1982): 3-21; 14, no. 4 (mars 1983): 39-50.

A series of reports on the automated SAPHIR system introduced in the records management and archives facilities at the Archives nationales du Québec. Part 1 deals with the origins of the system, methods and a look at available resources. Part 2 describes the new classification scheme introduced to facilitate the use of SAPHIR, a list of terms employed, a comparison of the old and new systems, and the codes used in the system. Part 3 looks at the actual production of research finding aids by the system, adds terms to the glossary, and gives examples of the forms used to input into the system. Part 4 deals with the second phase of the project, SAP-

HIR II, looking specifically at levels of description and the elements employed.

162 Roberge, M. "SAPHIR: l'informatique au service des archivistes et chercheurs québécois." *Documentaliste* 20, no. 1 (janvier/février 1983): 11-13.

An overview of the SAPHIR system, a computer-assisted finding aid operation, begun as a means of producing a descriptive guide to the record groups and manuscript collections in the province of Québec. A brief system history and functions are given.

163 Roper, M. "New information technology and archives." *UNESCO Journal of Information Science, Librarianship and Archives* 4, no. 2 (April-June 1982): 107-13.

The author suggests that, during the 1960's, expectations for computer use in archives was to access information at the single item level. However, indexing has proved too costly, and although names can be indexed easily, subjects are more ambiguous. Systems being considered currently are working at the series level: PRIAM (Cité des archives contemporaines, Archives de France) and NARS-5 (U.S. National Archives and Records Service), for example, and/or are computer-assisted rather than computer-based systems: NARS-AL (U.S. National Archives), PROSPEC (Public Records Office, U.K.), NRMC II (Manuscripts Division of the Library of Congress, U.S.), and PARADIGM (University of Illinois, U.S.), for example. Other systems like SPINDEX (NARS, U.S.) work at the file level, and still others are adapted bibliographic systems like MARC, MRMC and INSPEC or text-processing systems like STAIRS and ATMS. He also notes that if, as has been indicated, the provenance method of subject retrieval meets user needs more effectively than subject specific content indexing, then perhaps it is better to concen-

trate on computer-assisted finding aids rather than those incorporated in a computer database.

164 Sadek, N. "CODOC for an archive." *Canadian Library Journal* 39, no. 2 (April 1982): 75-77.

The Guelph Document System is discussed in this article, focusing on the adaptation of CODOC to archival records. It examines the fields and codes employed, points out the difficulties and changes that have to be made in the original system, and points to another method for producing computer-generated indexes.

165 Society of American Archivists. National Information Systems Task Force. *A MARC format for archives and manuscript materials*. Chicago: Society of American Archivists, September 1982.

A proposed revision to *Manuscripts: A MARC Format* (1973) and its 1977 addenda (MARBI proposal 82-19), intended to accommodate regardless of its form. It conforms to the ideas presented in AACR2, as applied to a machine-readable cataloguing situation.

166 Society of American Archivists. National Information Systems Task Force. *Data elements used in archives, manuscript and records repository information systems: A dictionary of standard terminology*. Chicago: Society of American Archivists, National Information Systems Task Force, October 1982, 20 p.

See 018 for notation.

167 Wheaton, B.R. "A computer database system to store and display archival data on correspondence of historical significance." *The American Archivist* 45, no. 4 (Fall 1982): 455-66.

A description of what is essentially an online name/chronological indexing system created to fill a gap discovered in available inventories describing the papers of individual physicists which did not provide a complete list of represented correspondents. The idea was to create a cross-file listing by "physicist, correspondent, and by physical location of archives."

4.0 Media Archives 168-189

168 Beaulne, B. *Projet de traitement primaire de l'information émanant des producteurs et distributeurs de documents audiovisuels*. Montréal: Université de Montréal, 1973, 66 p.

A project description recommending the establishment of a cataloguing-in-process approach to the initial documentation of audiovisual materials by producers and distributors. It is not specifically designed for archival use; the objectives presented for describing audiovisual material are in keeping with general needs only.

169 Betz, E., comp. *Graphic materials: Rules for describing original items and historical collections*. Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress, 1982, 155 p.

Under the general structure of AACR2, this work is intended to provide practical cataloguing guidance for graphic materials and was compiled under the leadership of Elisabeth Betz, with the help of a committee of five. Three levels of description are provided for, the third representing the maximum which includes all of the elements set out in the rules.

170 Bluck, R. "A media cataloguing project at Birmingham Polytechnic." *Audiovisual Librarian* 10, no. 2 (Spring 1984): 97-99.

A look at the media cataloguing system utilized by Birmingham Polytechnic. The system attempts to keep description to a minimum as part of Birmingham Libraries Co-operative Mechanization Project (BLCMP).

171 Carson, D.M. "Cataloging nonbook materials." *Wilson Library Bulletin* 39, no. 7 (March 1965): 562-64.

A selection of elements for the description of NBM, emphasizing the need for standard principles of descriptive cataloguing which include special materials, rather than the creation of separate, special rules.

172 Chenhall, R.G. *Museum cataloging in the computer age*. Nashville, Tennessee: American Association for State and Local History, 1975, 261 p.

A general look at the potential use of computer technology in museums, which includes a chapter on "What to Record: The Content of Museum Catalogs" (Ch. 4). It deals with the difficulty of creating "data categories" or recorded observations of attributes or dimensions of a museum piece. The various levels of description needed for museum cataloguing parallel those required for archival description.

173 Conseil International des musées/International Council of Museums. "Inventaire et informatique/Computerization." *Nouvelles du CIM/ICOM News* 29, no. 3 (1976): 4 and 38.

A brief report on the UNESCO organized meeting "Modern Methods of Inventory of Movable Cultural Property" held in Barcelona Spain, 4-8 October 1976. Recommendations formulated at the meeting are listed, among them the adoption of a national policy on the documentation of their cultural heritage, including national standards for documentation, and five categories

of data which constitute the minimum elements of information to be recorded in an inventory. For example, information elements suggested are: "the name of the museum, the identity of the object and a unique reference number given to the object by the museum"; "the existence of reproductions and secondary information sources"; "a brief identifying description"; a brief history, especially, when, where and by whom the object was made; and finally, the object's museum history (exhibitions, conservation, restoration and so forth).

174 Cos, C.T. "The cataloging of nonbook materials: Basic guidelines." *Library Resources & Technical Services* 15, no. 4 (Fall 1971): 472-78.

An attempt to provide a standardized method for cataloguing non-book items using a card indexing system. Specified are: the basis for call number, main entry, contributor's statement, imprint, physical description, notes and tracings.

175 Ehrenberg, R.E. "Aural and graphic archives and manuscripts." *Drexel Library Quarterly* 11, no. 1 (January 1975): 55-71.

This article suggests that researchers are "more interested in the subject content of graphics than their organizational or functional relationships" and that there is a need to describe the graphics individually, although collective description is feasible in some cases. A self-indexing reference print file based on the categories portraits, places, subjects and events, for handling photographic records is proposed. For sound recordings the author feels that description in the form of catalogue cards or special lists is more useful than collection description.

176 Hagler, R. "The development of cataloging rules for nonbook materials." *Library Resources & Technical Services* 19, no. 3 (Summer 1975): 268-78.

A critical look at AACR as a standard, noting its limited scope, that is, the type of media to be included, ambiguous terminology, ambiguous use of main entry heading and medium designators, unspecified citation for performance credits and the degree of required description.

177 Harrison, H.P. "Non-book materials: A decade of development?" *Journal of Documentation* 35, no. 3 (September 1979): 207-48.

A review of some current literature on librarianship of non-book materials which includes a brief look at the standardization of definitions and description of these materials.

178 International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions. Working Group on the International Standard Bibliographic Description for Non-Book Materials. *ISBD (NBM): International standard bibliographic description for non-book materials*. London: IFLA International Office for UBC, 1977, 61 p.

A standard generally intended for material published in multiple copy whether a simple visual aid or a sophisticated electronic product, which conforms to ISBD (G) with some minor variations. The introduction to the standard suggests that it might require some elaboration before it can be applied to material which has become "obsolete" or to meet sound, film and other archive requirements.

179 Kaufman, J. "A system for cataloging and classifying

visual resources." *Library Resources & Technical Services* 23, no. 2 (Spring 1979): 168-76.

A University Archives of the State University of New York at Buffalo system for visual resource cataloguing and classification based on AACR2 principles, and adaptable to collections of varying sizes and complexities.

180 Lamy-Rousseau, F. *Traitement automatisé des documents multimédias avec les systèmes ISBD unifiés, Lamy-Rousseau et Précis.* Montréal: Propositions S.I.L.P., 1974, 214 p.

A description of a system developed for the automation of the "Centre de documentation du Service des moyens d'enseignement du Ministère de l'Education." A history of the systems development, the multi-media format, codes, terminology, fields and elements are given with examples provided.

181 Lamy-Rousseau, F. *Code Lamy-Rousseau: Supplément à "Inventoriez et classez facilement vos documents audio-visuels / Easy method for inventory-taking and classification of audio-visual material."* 1 éd. révisée. Longueuil: M.F. Rousseau, 1974, 2 p.

Experiments with the code proved it required some additions and changes, which are outlined here.

182 Lewis, E.M. "Visual indexing of graphic material." *Special Libraries* 67, no. 11 (November 1976): 518-27.

This article examines the cost-effectiveness and efficiency of using visual images of graphic material rather than using printed descriptions for retrieval. This system is similar to "picture indexing," but microfiche, Super 8 film or videotape is used to save on costs. A computer generated key-word list carries a single directional number which then leads to the visual index.

183 Linford, J.E. "The EUDISED format: A unified approach to recording book and non-book materials." *The Audiovisual Librarian* 2, no. 1 (Spring 1975): 26-28.

The author suggests that the adoption of a single standard for non-book materials seems remote with four major codes havein already been adopted to varying degrees, the four codes being AACR, LANCET, Riddle and AECT. The shortcomings of LANCET (the Library Association/National Council for Education Technology code) are discussed, concluding however that on a general scale it is "infinitely preferable to its rivals" despite being "internally loose" (that is, the specifics) with some lack of consistency. For example, the principle of multi-level cataloguing has been accepted in the code but the specifics omit any kind of series statement.

184 Taylor, V. "Media designations." *Library Resources & Technical Services* 17, no. 1 (Winter 1973): 60-65.

Distinguishing media designations and nonprint material description are examined here, giving some of the terms which have come to be regarded as standards, the value of generic or specific terms, the location of designators in the description, and concludes that a generic term after the titles is a useful research device.

185 Tillin, A.M., and W.J. Quinly. *Standards for cataloging nonprint materials*. Washington, D.C.: Association for Educational Communications and Technology, 1976, 230 p.

The article starts with basic cataloguing rules for all types of nonprint materials (elements for identification, description and retrieval of a work), and then goes into the application of the rules for specific media types (charts, globes, machine-readable data files, maps, microforms, slides, and so forth).

186 Trebble, A. "Progress in documentation: Non-book materials." *Journal of Documentation* 28, no. 1 (March 1972): 151-59.

A look at terminology for non-book materials and the organizations dealing with documentation of NBM, which concludes the most useful work is being done through NCET (National Council for Educational Technology—U.K.).

187 Vance, D. *Manual for museum computer network data preparation*. Stony Brook, New York: University of New York at Stony Brook, 1975, 76 p.

A list of general rules for the input of records into the Museum Computer Network. The "records" on a MCN file describe one "entity," which can be an object, a person or group, a document, a place, an event or a concept. Conventions for punctuation, spacing and so forth are supplied in addition to the fields, elements and a glossary of the "tags" employed.

188 Vézina, R. "The computer: Passing fad or thoroughgoing revolution?" *Visual Resources* 1, nos. 2 and 3 (Fall/Winter 1980-81): 204-18.

The responsibility of the museum to its public and current limitations on access are examined here through a look at textual and pictorial catalogues. Three levels of analysis are identified as currently being available: analysis on a general level as provided in a museum's main catalogue, "iconographic" analysis from which subject catalogues are developed, and finally, "formal" analysis such as that being done in Italy by Carlo Ragghianti.

189 Weihs, J.R., *et al. Nonbook materials: The organization of integrated collections*. Ottawa: Canadian Library Association, 1979. 2d ed.

A work resulting from the joint efforts of the Canadian Library Association and their Joint Advisory Committee on Nonbook Materials, which provides the basis for cataloguing an "omnimedia" catalogue. It is based on the principles of the AACR (Parts I and II), which are varied only if the specific demands of the media required such a variation.

4.1 Cartographic Archives 190-202

190 British Standards Institution. *Recommendations for bibliographical references to maps and charts. Part 1: References in accessions lists.* London: British Standards Institution, 1977, 7 p.

The scope, definitions, presentation and descriptive elements for early manuscript maps, early printed maps, modern manuscripts, modern printed maps and facsimile maps are described in this work, complete with examples.

191 Caron, G. "Traitement des documents cartographiques dans les petits dépôts: Leur classement et leur description." *Archives* 13, no. 2 (September 1981): 85-91.

A discussion of the difficulties involved in maintaining maps and other cartographic materials in small archive repositories, both as part of an archive group and as individual items. These records are usually organized in one of three ways: according to provenance; thematically; or by region. Their description should be done in the same manner as is done for other archives. The only descriptive variation might be the addition of specific cartographic elements, particularly for item-by-item descriptions.

192 Chamberlain, D.R. "Report on PRECIS and AACR2 at

176.

the map division of the Provincial Archives of British Columbia." *Association of Canadian Map Libraries Bulletin* 37 (December 1980): 34-39.

A brief overview of PRECIS (Preserved Context Indexing System) in a practical context, including working examples. A modified version of AACR2 provides the basis for description.

193 Chamberlain, D.R. "The description of cartographic archives using the Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules, second edition." *Archivaria* 13, (Winter 1981-82): 41-46.

In introducing this article the author examines why formal rules of description are necessary, the role of finding aids, and some specific rules for archives. The main body of the article deals with those chapters in AACR2 which pertain to cartographic materials, and concludes by recommending the general adoption of these rules in conjunction with a manual of interpretation.

194 Ehrenberg, R.E. "Non-geographic methods of map arrangement and classification." *Drexel Library Quarterly* 9, no. 4 (October 1973): 49-60.

Ehrenberg looks toward alternate methods of arrangement and classification of maps, including arrangement by provenance, rather than employing traditional methods only. When describing the provenance method he notes the importance of related textual documents. Even if the textual documents are housed separately, they should be described and arranged in the same manner as the maps they support to facilitate ease of research. Both organizational (as used by the U.S. National Archives) and functional (as used by the Archives nationales de France) archival arrangement/description is described.

177

195 Ehrenberg, R.E. "Administration of cartographic materials in the Library of Congress and National Archives of the United States." *Archivaria* 13 (Winter 1981-82): 23-39.

The procedures used to deal with cartographic material, on a national level in the United States, including acquisition, accessioning, classification/ arrangement, and cataloguing/ description, reference and preservation. The cataloguing/ description section starts with the four types of finding aids used by the Library of Congress ("titling," cartobibliographies, machine-readable catalogues & graphic indexes), followed by NARS accession descriptions, inventories, guides and indexes.

196 International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions. Joint Working Group on the International Bibliographic Description for Cartographic Materials. *ISBD(CM): International standard bibliographic description for cartographic materials*. London: IFLA International Office for UBC, 1977, 58 p.

The ISBD(CM) adheres to the ISBD(G) with minor variations for the specific requirements of cartographic materials. The standard is outlined including a description of how all of the ISBDs have been developed, a look at those materials which qualify as cartographic, specialized terms, examples and multi-level description.

197 Klemp, E. "On the access to cartographic collections in GDR Libraries." *INSPEL* 16, no. 1 (1982): 21-30.

Klemp starts with a brief history of the arrangement and cataloguing procedure used by German Democratic Republic map collections. Currently, a slightly elaborated version of ISBD(CM) is the basis for most

178

description. The description entries are discussed in some detail and examples from significant collections are offered.

198 MARC Development Office. *Maps: A MARC format: Specification for magnetic tapes containing catalog records for maps*. 2d ed.

The American National Standard for Bibliographic Information Interchange on Magnetic Tape (Z39.2-1971) is implemented in this format, designed to pertain to all materials with some variation in the content designators (tags, indicators and subfield codes).

199 Schroeder, J.R. "Perspectives on map cataloging and classification." *Library Trends* 29, no. 3 (Winter 1981): 419-38.

A look at progress made in recent years including cooperative cataloguing, subject access and descriptive cataloguing standards. Some doubts about the validity of AACR2 as an acceptable standard are expressed, with a discussion of the objectives and guidelines produced by the Anglo-American Cataloguing Committee for Cartographic Materials (AACCCM).

200 Stibbe, H.L.P. *MARC-Maps: The history of its development and a current assessment*. Utrecht: Geografisch Instituut van de Rijksuniversiteit, 1976. 293 p.

A study tracing the MARC format for maps as it developed in the United States, Canada and the Netherlands. The format is examined from the user's point of view, analyzing the terminology, fields, codes, and elements including "main entry," "imprint data" and "scale data."

201 Stibbe, H.L.P., ed. *Cartographic materials: A manual of interpretation for AACR2*. Ottawa: CLA, 1982, 258 p.

As the title suggests, this is a supplement for cataloguing cartographic materials using the principles expressed in AACR2, providing modifications required for the specific medium being described. Examples and a glossary of terms are included.

202 Wallis, H. "British map collections: Cooperative planning and projects." *INSPEL* 17, no. 4 (1983): 239-50.

Presented are the developments in map cataloguing and the interpretation of AACR2 for cartographic materials. The UK MARC map format, MAPLIB and MAPSYS systems are described, the last two having been developed independent of the national cartographic library system.

4.2 Machine-Readable Archives 203-209

203 Alldredge, E.O. "Inventorying magnetic-media records." *The American Archivist* 35, nos. 3 and 4 (July/October 1972): 337-45.

A report on the National Archives and Record Service (NARS) project to establish adequate magnetic tape inventories, concentrating on the questions that should be answered while putting an inventory together. The GSA Form 7036 used for the federal Magnetic Tape Record Inventory and the GSA form 7091 used for the federal Data Archives Inventory are included, breaking down the elements regarded as essential to describe magnetic media.

204 Bell, L. *The archival implications of machine-readable records*. Washington, D.C.: ICA, VIII International Congress on Archives, 27 September—1 October 1976, 18 p.

A look at machine-readable archives based on the experience of the Public Archives of Canada where a library cataloguing format is being used, justified by the fact that this type of archive more closely resembles books than conventional archive series and standardization is made more practical. Detailed description for these records is vital but difficult to achieve.

205 Bell, L. "The archival implications of machine-readable records." *Archivum* 26 (1979): 85-92.

A report to the 8th International Congress on Archives (Washington, 27 September—1 October 1976) which looks briefly at finding aids for machine-readable records and points to the Public Archives of Canada's use of a library catalogue format as a viable means of description. It is noted that the nature of the information and its use make provenance-oriented finding aids less helpful than in other archival situations.

206 Canada. Public Archives/ Archives publiques. *The machine readable archives: An overview of its operations and procedures/ Les archives ordinolingues: Une vue d'ensemble sur ses opérations et procédés*. Ottawa: Ministry of Supply and Services Canada, 1980, 17 p.

As the title suggests, this is a general overview of the PAC procedures for machine-readable archives. Included in the "Accessioning/Processing" chapter is a look at important data elements and cataloguing procedures. The MRA uses the Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules (AACR2) as revised by the American Library As-

sociation Subcommittee on Rules for Cataloging Machine Readable Data Files (MRDF), in a multi-level descriptive system involving standard catalogue entries, data abstracts, content documentation or codebook, and a record of the physical and logical characteristics of the file.

207 Dodd, S.A. *Cataloging machine-readable data files: An interpretive manual*. Chicago: American Library Association, 1982, 247 p.

An extension of AACR2, taking into account the specific needs to be considered when cataloguing machine-readable data files, and based upon the author's interpretation of the ALA's recommendations for AACR2.

208 Machine-Readable Data Files Secretariat. *Report on the conference on cataloging and information services for machine-readable data files*. Arlington, VA: MRDF Conference Secretariat, 1978, 210 p.

A collection of the presentations given at the March 1978 MRDF Cataloging and Information Services Conference, the objective of the conference being to coordinate "the development and implementation of standards for controlling MRDF" (p. 81). Included are "state-of-the-art" reports, comments on major issues, future strategy, conference conclusions, recommendations and follow-up activities. Among the presentations is one by Sue A. Dodd, "Cataloging Machine-Readable Data File—A First Step?"

209 Warner, R.M., and F.X. Blouin, Jr. "Some implications of records in machine-readable form for traditional archival practice." *Archivists and Machine-Readable Records*, ed. C.L. Geda, E.W. Austin, and F.X. Blouin, Jr. Pro-

182

ceedings of the conference on Archival Management of Machine-Readable Records. Ann Arbor, Michigan, 7-10 February 1979, pp. 242-48.

The authors see arrangement and description of machine produced archival material "changing" out of necessity. They note: "rather than providing a folder level description of a collection, archivists will have to provide a sense of the structure of the file (on tape, for example)—how it was put together—and then provide programmed access procedures for recalling specific items."

4.3 Documentary Art Archives 210-223

210 Castonguay, D. "Approche sujet en iconographie canadienne à l'aide d'un lexique de termes contrôlés." *Inventaire informatis des oeuvres d'art/ Computerized inventory standards for works of art*. Ed. R. Vézina. Montréal: Fides, 1981, 269-80.

A report to a 1979 conference held in Ottawa, dealing with art inventory standards and the development of a thesaurus for Canadian iconography to code works of art.

211 Clavet, A. *Guide to Canadian photographic archives: Directions for the description of photographic records kept in Canadian repositories/ Guide des archives photographiques canadiennes: Directives relatives à la description des documents photographiques conservés dans les dépôts d'archives canadiens*. Ottawa: National Photography Collection/ Collection nationale de photographie, 1977, 14 p.

A preparatory guide to archival photographic description for entries in the *Guide to Canadian Photographic*

Archives, to promote standardization of the entries from the various contributing repositories. It includes some basic definitions, the form of a description, examples and general rules.

212 Logan, A.-M. "Online subject access in the photographic archive at the Yale Center for British Art." *Proceedings of the ASIS Annual Meeting* 19 (1982): 169-75.

A report to the 45th Annual Meeting of ASIS in Columbus, Ohio on a database management system known as FOCUS describing how the system works. Previous to 1980 the Yale Center had been employing the GRIPHOS system for online subject access. Initially access included exhibition history, provenance and option fields, but for financial reasons these were dropped from FOCUS. A subject index using their own subject authority list remains as the core of the system.

213 Markey, K. "Computer-assisted construction of a thematic catalog of primary and secondary subject matter." *Visual Resources* 3, no. 1 (1983): 16-49.

Outlined here is a thematic method for cataloguing works of art based on the categories developed by Erwin Panofsky to study the subject matter or meaning in art. The categories are: primary subject matter equals objects, expressional qualities and events; secondary subject matter which equals stories, images and allegories; and "intrinsic meaning or content" which equals symbolic values. "Searching aids" based on these themes can "translate" primary subject matter into appropriate symbolic themes thus helping searchers who are not trained in iconography, a problem found in currently used finding aids which are geared to secondary subject matter.

214 Ohlengren, T.H. "Subject access of visual resources: A survey." *Visual Resources* 1, no. 1 (Spring 1980): 67-73.

The lack of standards for subject access to works of art and their surrogates, the need for a thesaurus of subject descriptors and the general lack of agreement on the achievement of these goals are addressed in this article by Ohlengren.

215 Ohlengren, T.H. "Conference on computerized inventory standards for works of art: A review." *Visual Resources* 1, nos. 2 and 3 (Fall/Winter 1980-81): 200-203.

Some of the barriers which exist to gaining subject access for works of art are delineated in this article. It provides a summary of papers and projects dealing with this issue, and includes papers on the application of computers to museum documents and data, important considerations for establishing standards, and the development of a thesaurus for controlled indexing.

216 Roddy, K. "The Belmont conference on subject access." *Visual Resources* 2, nos. 1, 2, 3 (Fall/ Winter/Spring 1981-82): 101-11.

A summary of discussion from the 1980 Belmont Conference held in Elridge Maryland on indexing standards, the establishment of a vocabulary for a system of iconography, subject categorization, and the role of a permanent subject access organization for visual resources. It includes a list of the basic requirements for subject access and the specific fields to be identified in a subject record.

217 Schoenherr, D.E. *Standards for the descriptive cataloguing of paintings, drawings, watercolours, prints and posters in the Picture Division*. Ottawa: PAC, 1979, 81 p.

An attempt to define descriptive cataloguing standards for use in the Picture Division of the PAC and to adapt those standards to the Fine and Decorative Arts Data Base of the National Inventory Programme (NIP). The fields used accommodate titles, accession number, institution, record number, dimensions, dates, names of creators, creators' dates and biography, physical condition, inscriptions, publisher, references to the work, and cataloguer.

218 Schoenherr, D.E. "Standards developed by the Picture Division of the Public Archives of Canada for description of works of art." *Inventaire informatisé des oeuvres d'art/ Computerized inventory standards for works of art*. Ed. R. Vézina, Montréal: Fides, 1981, 233-60.

A presentation given at the 1979 Conference held in Ottawa. It provides a brief summary of 1977 and 1979 reports covering the development of descriptive cataloguing standards for drawings, paintings, watercolours, prints and posters, intended to satisfy the requirements of the institution, of art history methodology, and the National Inventory Programme. Eleven basic elements were identified as essential. Unique number; artist's name and dates; title or description; date of execution; medium or technique and support; and dimensions are some of the most important.

219 Seifried, C. "Access to the National Photography Collection." *The Archivist/ L'Archiviste* 6, no. 3 (September-October 1979): 7-8.

A brief look at organization and access to the National Photography Collection at the Public Archives of Canada, whose finding aids include those created by the original owners. Inventories, indexes, and guides emphasize the source or provenance of each collection.

186

220 Seifried, C. *Descriptive and subject cataloguing at the National Photography Collection, Public Archives of Canada*. Ottawa: PAC, 1981, 20 p. & thesaurus of subject headings.

This publication is not intended to be an official PAC one but rather to "facilitate communication between professionals." Listed are the elements that should be included in a photograph's description, the information sources and some general spacing and punctuation rules for finding aids to facilitate standardization of their physical appearance as well as content standardization. The author establishes descriptive areas, such as a title area, physical description area, control and location number region, collection name location, photographer's name area, and subject area.

221 Vézina, R., ed. *Inventaire informatisé des oeuvres d'art/ Computerized inventory standards for works of art*. Colloque du 1 au 3 Novembre 1979/ Conference November 1-3 1979 Proceedings. Montréal: Fides, 1981, 287 p.

A collection of presentations given at a 1979 Conference in Ottawa dealing with computerized art inventory standards introduced and organized by R. Vézina. He notes the profound effect that computerization has, and will have, on the way in which artistic works are described. A program initiated by the Public Archives of Canada Picture Division is used to illustrate the author's point.

222 Vogt, D.L. *The administration of photographic collections: A speech outline*. The American Association for State and Local History. 1980 Seminar on the Administration of Photographic Collections, March 17-20. Oakland, California: Oakland Museum, 1980, 62 p.

As part of this general work, the segment on cataloguing lists essential descriptive elements and summarizes the descriptive systems currently available: Subject Name Index; Key Word Filing; Classified Key Word Filing; Accession Number Filing; A Master Index Log; Self-Indexing Work File; Card Catalog; Cutter Number System; Punch Card Cataloging; Computer Indexing—Key Word, KWOC, Clueword, Uniterm, Griphos, Spindex; Classified Systems—Dewey Decimal, Colon, Bliss Classification, UDC, Microfilm Retrieval; and Archival Arrangement Systems.

223 Wilson, W.N. "Photographic cataloguing case studies." *Archifacts* 23 (September 1982): 644-51.

Taken from the proceedings of a seminar in Wellington, New Zealand from 28-30 August 1981, it looks at some of the difficulties encountered when attempting to catalogue photographs by presenting two case studies. The system established at the National Museum in New Zealand attempted to overcome some of these difficulties, and is described here including the basic descriptive elements: for example, collection name, photographer's name, location of negative, location of original print, physical identification.

4.4 Film Archives 224-232

224 ASLIB Film Production Librarians Group Cataloguing Committee. *Film cataloguing rules*. London: ASLIB (1963), 71 p.

A set of rules established by ASLIB which deal with film, sound and picture material, including form and content entries, punctuation, an extensive list of definitions, and specimen entries.

225 International Federation of Film Archives. Cataloguing Commission. *Film cataloging*. New York: Burt Franklin & Co., Inc., 1979, 174 p., pictures and forms.

This is a general work rather than a practical rules manual on film cataloguing, beginning with the importance of thorough description. It also outlines a variety of manual and automated systems, indicating their strengths and weaknesses, and looks at numerous ways to describe film content.

226 International Federation of Film Archives. *A handbook for film archives*. Brussels: FIAF, 1980, 151 p.

A general handbook which includes a chapter by Eileen Bowser on film cataloguing. She summarizes basic considerations to be made for "preliminary cataloguing" through to the "basic catalogue." Elements are listed, sources given, a look at what film description and possible supplementary files are mentioned.

227 Lamy-Rousseau, F. *Inventoriez et classez facilement vos documents audio-visuels/ Easy method for inventory-taking and classification of audio-visual material*. Quebec: Bibliothèque nationale du Québec, 1972, 197 p.

An alphanumeric code intended for describing all types of audio-visual material by "exact nature of the media, the format, year the document was edited, and the colour." It can be used in combination with key-word (subject) headings on cards, with keywords assembled by computer on periodical or cumulative lists, or with traditional library classification schemes. The elements of description vary according to need for each category of material, such as for filmstrips or phonodiscs. A glossary of terms and a bibliography are included.

228 MARC Development Office. *Films: A MARC format*. Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress, 1976, 65 p.

A machine-readable cataloguing format for motion pictures, filmstrips and other pictorial media (slides, transparencies, videotape and so forth). Content designators are described (tags, indicators, and subfield codes) for specific film types.

229 Massonneau, S. "Developments in the organization of audiovisual materials." *Library Trends* 25, no. 3 (January 1977): 665-84.

A historical look at the development of code for descriptive cataloguing of audiovisual materials. It includes an examination of *Standards for Cataloging Nonprint Materials* by Tillin and Quinly, a look at AACR, and at ISBD.

230 Moulds, M. *FIAF classification scheme for literature on film and television*. London: ASLIB, 1980, 85 p.

The description of a classification scheme derived from the Universal Decimal Classification for use in film and television archives. It is intended for an international audience, and includes 180 examples.

231 Smither, R.B.N., and D.J. Penn, comps. *Film cataloguing handbook*. London: Imperial War Museum, 1976, 57 p.

A handbook to APPARAT (Archive Preservation Programme and Retrieval by Automated Techniques), the Imperial War Museum's computer-based information processing and storage system for their film and sound collections. Entries in this system are designed to give the potential user essential information through an alphabetically arranged list of film titles available on ei-

190

ther paper or microfiche. These titles can be manipulated according to five stipulated criteria.

232 UNESCO. *International rules for the cataloguing of educational scientific and cultural films and filmstrips on 3" x 5" (7.5cm x 12.5cm) cards*. Paris: UNESCO, 1956, 53 p.

A set of rules devised as a result of the combined efforts of working groups established at a conference on International Standards for Film Cataloguing held in Washington, 11-12 May 1953. Part II is devoted to "Rules for Descriptive Cataloguing," giving entry elements and format for original and foreign language versions of films and filmstrips.

4.5 Sound Archives 233-238

233 Bibliothèque centrale de prêt de la Côte-Nord. *Le service du disque (manuel technique)*. Sept-Iles, Québec: B.C.P.C.N., 1980, 56 p.

A practical working manual for music sound recordings, including classification and cataloguing rules which agree in principle with AACR2. Examples and a place-name index are included.

234 Campbell, F. "APPARAT: A computer cataloguing system for sound recordings." *Archives and Manuscripts* 8, no. 2 (December 1980): 33-40.

Because of the nature of these archival materials, "browsing" is inhibited, therefore finding aids must provide more detail. This article looks at Archive Preservation Programme and Retrieval by Automated Techniques, otherwise known as the APPARAT system, which can produce several finding aids from a single

191

database (a comprehensive catalogue, ad hoc lists, indexes and printed catalogues). The fields used provide data on five categories of information—interviewee, interview housekeeping (copyright and so forth), synopsis, and index terms.

235 Daily, L.E. *Cataloging phonorecordings: Problems and possibilities*. New York: Marcel Dekker, Inc., 1975, 172 p.

A cataloguing work which includes a chapter on the principles of description along with more specifically library-oriented rules.

236 Smither, R., and L. Kamel. "Cataloguing and indexing." In *An archive approach to oral history*. Ed. D. Lance. London: Imperial War Museum, 1978, 24-35.

This portion of Lance's book deals with the creation of finding aids for oral history collections in archival institutions. The index is highlighted as the key to the collection's catalogue rather than to the collection itself. The author suggests that, regardless of the medium, a single piece of descriptive documentation should be possible for item identification and description.

237 Sound Archives Section, National Film Archives/ Service des archives sonores, archives nationales du film. *Sound archives guide to procedures/ Les archives sonores, guide méthodologique*. Ottawa: PAC, 1979, 29 p.

Accepted procedures followed by the Public Archives of Canada Sound Archives are outlined, including a section on description and "Rules for Description/Cataloguing in the Sound Archives." Finding aids include "basic listings," "listing in detail," and indexes. Standard vocabulary terms given are, for example, "talk,"

"speech," "radio programme," and "sound documentary."

238 Varga, I. "Bibliographic description of sound recordings." *International Cataloguing* 11, no. 1 (January/March 1982): 7-8.

The introduction from Ildiko Varga's *Bibliographic description of sound recordings: A guide* (1981), which makes the distinction between books and sound recordings and gives a set of principles for description.

5.0 General Development of Standards 239-263

239 Avram, H.D., S.H. McCallum, and M.S. Price. "Organizations contributing to development of library standards." *Library Trends* 31, no. 2 (Fall 1982): 197-223.

An investigation of what is being done by whom in the U.S. and internationally, with respect to the development of standards. Some of the organizations named include ALA, ANDI, ISO, IFLA, NFAIS, and ANSI. Also mentioned are international bodies who, although not actually establishing standards, are influential in implementing them, for example ABACUS.

240 Canadian Task Group on Cataloguing Standards. "Cataloguing standards." *The report of the Canadian Task Group on cataloguing standards*. Ottawa: National Library of Canada, 1972, 91 p.

As part of this report, a chapter on "Standardization of entry and bibliographic description" and on "Analysis of recommendations by institution affected" have been included.

241 Consultative Group on Canadian Archives. Report of

the consultative group on Canadian archives. Ottawa: Secretariat of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, 1979, 140 p.

A general look at the current state of Canadian archives, including recommendations for improvement. While examining archival description, the Consultative Group notes that: "the lack of uniformity of descriptive and cataloguing methods seriously hinders the creation of an information system at the national level" (p. 117). A list of possible projects to improve this situation is also given.

242 Cook, T., ed. *Archival citations/ Références aux documents d'archives*. Ottawa: PAC, 1983, 28 p.

This booklet pulls together the important elements to be used when citing archival material, and the data needed to locate and describe an original record. Citations are outlined for media archives; cartographic and architectural records; film, television and sound records; machine-readable data files; painting, drawings and prints; photographs; private manuscripts and government records.

243 Dierickx, H. "The UNISIST reference manuals and UNIBID—Standardization for development." *Program* 17, no. 2 (April 1983): 68-85.

The author describes the purpose and principles behind the reference manuals for bibliographic description and justifies standardization. Some historical perspectives and proposals for the future are submitted. Related international efforts for the standardization of bibliographic description/ cataloguing and formats for machine-readable communication are given, as well as a look at why international standardization has yet to be accomplished.

244 Evans, Max, and Lisa B. Weber, comps. *MARC for archives and manuscripts: A compendium of practice*. Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 1985.

Organized in field number order, this compendium summarizes the US/MARC Archives and Manuscripts Control format for each field and follows with a narrative description of users' practice at selected university, state, and church repositories, emphasizing variations and offering examples. Appendices include standard terminology for specific fields as well as examples of fully tagged records.

245 Frase, R.W. "Procedures for development and access to published standards." *Library Trends* 31, no. 2 (Fall 1982): 225-36.

The development of two types of technical standards affecting information services are identified here—"official" (for example ISO standards) and "de facto" standards (for example AACR2).

246 Harris, J.L. "Document description and representation." *Annual Review of Information Science and Technology* 9 (1974): 81-117.

An extensive overview of work being done during the mid-1970's to standardize bibliographic description and representation by both international and U.S. national bodies. Also included is a literature review of relevant works.

247 Henderson, M.M. "Standards: Developments and impacts." *Special Libraries* 30, no. 5 (September 1969): 142-48.

This article looks at attempts to establish standards, sug-

gesting an evaluation of the steps and procedures in an operation (system analysis) as necessary and useful before any attempt is made to establish standards, what are the data elements and are they necessary. It is also suggested that standardization should be taken by degree, formalizing minimum levels of operations "to accommodate a larger section of the community involved. Once a core is established additional details can be added for local conventions."

248 Henderson, M.M. "Standards: Developments and impacts." *Special Libraries* 7, no. 2 (April 1981): 142-56.

An update of the 1969 article which looks at mechanisms, problems encountered in the past, and current general efforts to standardize library activities.

249 International Federation of Library Associations Committee on Cataloguing. *Statement of principles*. London: IFLA, 1971, 119 p.

The principles of library cataloguing adopted by the International Conference on Cataloguing Principles, Paris, October 1961. These generalized principles were developed after cataloguing codes from a variety of countries were examined.

250 International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions Working Group on the General Bibliographic Description. *ISBD(G): General international standard bibliographic description: Annotated text*. London: IFLA International Office for UBC, 1977, 24 p.

A general structure rather than a cataloguing code in itself, which includes explanatory notes, definitions and examples. It is intended to aid in making different source cataloguing records interchangeable, to make

records easily interpretable regardless of the language used, and to contribute to the conversion of bibliographic records to those in machine-readable documents.

251 Jennings, M. "The electronic manuscript project: Working towards compatible industry standards." *ASIS Bulletin* 10, no. 3 (February 1984): 11-13.

A description of a project designed to develop standards for the preparation and processing of electronic manuscripts. Part of the article relates to bibliographic control of published works which use the original electronic files.

252 Malinconico, M.S. "Technology and Standards for Bibliographic Control." *Prospects for change in bibliographic control*. Ed. A. Bookstein, H.H. Fussler, and H.F. Schmierer. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976, 138 p.

Malinconico tackles the issue of applying computer logic to bibliographic control, and concludes that standards should not be adopted to facilitate ease of consistent mechanical application but rather to facilitate the consistency of quality. He also examines the meaning of the term "standard."

253 MARC Task Group. *Canadian MARC*. Ottawa: National Library of Canada, 1972, 242 p.

A report on the activities which resulted in a recommendation for a Canadian MARC format for monographs and serials. It is not a cataloguing standard but a report on the investigation into the requirements for MARC formats.

137

254 Mount, E. "A national standard for bibliographic references." *Journal of the American Society for Information Science* 28, no. 1 (January 1977): 3–12.

An authorized abridgement of *American National Standard for Bibliographic References ANSI Z39.29-1977*, presenting its basic theory, principles and definitions through the extensive use of examples. It is intended to facilitate the bibliographic description of all types of materials and media, for example, manuscripts, sound recordings, maps, films, art works, data files, legal materials, journals and monographs.

255 Paul, S.K., and J.E. Givens. "Standards viewed from the applications perspective." *Library Trends* 31, no. 2 (Fall 1982): 325-41.

A look at how standards are used, the user's involvement in the development of standards, the economic effects of standards, the work being done by ANSI.Z39, and includes a list of ANSI.Z39 published standards.

256 Rhoads, J.B. "Standardization for archives." *UNESCO Journal of Information Science, Librarianship and Archives Administration* 3, no. 3 (July-September 1981): 165-69.

Rhoads suggests that there is a need for a list of standardization activities being conducted internationally, that the principles and practices exist but have not been approached on a comprehensive basis, and that it is important to establish international standards. He also discusses work being done by UNESCO and the International Council on Archives.

257 Rush, J.E. "A proposed model for the development of an integrated set of standards for bibliographic and

related data." *Library Trends* 31, no. 2 (Fall 1982): 237-49.

The author stresses the need for a basic philosophy and carefully developed objectives behind a standards development program, to avoid conflicts and overlaps. A framework to plan and guide the process of developing standards and a hierarchical model of elements are presented.

258 Sahli, N. "Finding aids: A multi-media, systems perspective." *The American Archivist* 44, no. 1 (Winter 1981): 15-20.

See 079.

259 Sahli, Nancy, ed. *MARC for archives and manuscripts: The AMC format*. Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 1985.

A manual for archivists, manuscript curators, and researchers seeking information about the structure and use of the US/MARC Archives and Manuscripts Control format. The core of the volume, the format itself, contains all the relevant definitions, examples, and other information pertaining to the AMC format. Accompanied by examples of data entry, a bibliography and a glossary. In addition, this volume contains the Society of American Archivists's *Data Element Dictionary*.

260 Schmierer, H.F., M.K. Park, and R.S. Tannehill. "Bibliographic and information processing standards." *Annual Review of Science and Technology*, Washington, D.C.: American Society for Information Science (ASIS) 10: 105-38; 12 (1977): 59-89, 18 (1983): 61-94.

Three progressive reviews of standardization activities in the information field, beginning with Schmierer's

work, which also gives the definition of standards and the traditional methods of developing them.

261 Sylvestre, G. "Towards standardization of catalogues in Canada." *Canadian Library Journal* 30, no. 3 (May/June 1973): 252-59.

Outlined are the fifty-eight recommendations made by the Canadian Task Group on Cataloguing Standards and the decisions taken by the National Library. The recommendations themselves are fairly general, and most of them were accepted or directed to the appropriate authorities.

262 United States of America Standards Institute. *USA standard basic criteria for indexes*. New York: United States of America Standards Institute, 1969, 12 p.

Intended as a general standard for all types of indexes. It outlines the purpose, definitions, functions, scope, content and arrangement, variety, physical format, typography and style of an index.

263 Weil, B.H. "Are information standards really worthwhile?" *Bulletin of the American Society for Information Science* 1, no. 9 (April 1975). 26-27.

The author, as vice-chairman of the American National Standards Institute Standards committee Z39, responds to the challenge that the setting of information standards is both unnecessary and costly.

6.0 Filing 264-267

264 Association of Records Managers and Administrators. *Rules for alphabetical filing*. Bradford, Rhode Island: ARMA, 1972, 41 p.

Rules standardized by the Association of Records Managers and Administrators which include: names of individuals, names of business establishments, government and political designations, and "miscellaneous" rules.

265 Boucher, A. *Règles de classement des fiches de catalogue*. La Pocatière, Québec: Société du stage en bibliothéconomie de La Pocatière, 1982, 225 p.

Establishes classification and filing rules for catalogue entries. Part I gives a set of general rules for author-title catalogues, alphabetic-subject catalogues, and dictionary catalogues. Part II deals with established classification schemes (Dewey Decimal and Library of Congress) and the new schemes which have resulted from the introduction of computer technology to information centers.

266 Chauvin, Y. *Pratique du classement alphabétique*. Paris: Bordas, 1977.

A practical guide to the application of "classement alphabétique," beginning with a glossary of terms, followed by detailed rules for alphabetic lists and "répertoires."

267 Richter, N. *L'indexation alphabétique des matières*. Le Mans: Bibliothèque de l'Université du Maine, 1980, 91 p.

A practical manual for alphabetic indexing beginning with a look at its place in the documentation system, term definitions and rules and regulations for employing this technique, for example, punctuation, the use of geographic and proper names, dates, titles and subtitles. Followed by examples.

201